

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 11859) granting an increase of pension to Charley Setemeyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 11860) granting a pension to Phebe T. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 11861) granting a pension to James B. Rowley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 11862) granting a pension to Flora Ella Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLATFELTER: A bill (H. R. 11863) granting a pension to Rose Wernig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 11864) granting an increase of pension to Abbie M. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 11865) granting a pension to Sarah J. Kirkland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 11866) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Leach; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 11867) granting a pension to Irene M. Stanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 11868) granting an increase of pension to John Casey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 11869) granting an increase of pension to Francis Rounds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 11870) granting an increase of pension to Ada Z. Murdock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: A bill (H. R. 11871) for the relief of Stephen A. Farrell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 11872) granting an increase of pension to Cora E. Willetts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11873) granting a pension to James N. McNew; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 11874) granting an increase of pension to Maria J. Burnham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11875) granting an increase of pension to Marion S. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 11876) granting an increase of pension to Clarinda A. Spear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 11877) granting a pension to Josephine Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11878) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Sias; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11879) for the relief of Belle H. Walker and Frank E. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 11880) granting a pension to Louisa Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Resolution (H. Res. 411) for the relief of the estate of John M. Larson, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3506. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Municipal Assembly of Ponce, P. R., favoring the enactment of legislation permitting Porto Rico to elect its own governor; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

3507. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of Frelon A. Mott and other residents of Chicago, opposing passage of Senate bill 3218, a bill to secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3508. By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of the residents of Bend, Oreg., to the House of Representatives not to concur in the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) nor to pass any other religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3509. Also, petition of residents of Hood River, Oreg., opposing certain legislation, to wit: The compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) and asking the House of Representatives not to pass any other religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3510. By Mr. LEE of California: Petition of 16 citizens of Sonoma County, Calif., protesting against Senate bill 3218, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3511. By Mr. MacLAFFERTY: Petition of citizens of Alameda County, Calif., opposing the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) and any other national religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3512. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of Cleveland Branch, Railway Mail Association, for the passage of House bill 11444, to provide increase in postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

3513. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of board of trustees of the Eastern State Penitentiary of Pennsylvania, protesting against the Parker-Fess bill, requiring the labeling of all prison-made goods, and the Zihlman bill which would prohibit the interstate shipment of prison-made goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, January 23, 1925

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 22, 1925)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The principal legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Elkins	Keyes	Reed, Mo.
Ball	Ernst	King	Sheppard
Bayard	Ferris	McCormick	Shields
Bingham	Fess	McKellar	Shipstead
Borah	Fletcher	McKinley	Shortridge
Brookhart	Frazier	McLean	Simmons
Broussard	George	McNary	Smith
Bruce	Gerry	Mayfield	Smoot
Bursum	Gooding	Means	Spencer
Butler	Greene	Metcalf	Stanfield
Cameron	Hale	Moses	Sterling
Capper	Harrell	Neely	Swanson
Caraway	Harris	Norris	Underwood
Copeland	Harrison	Oddie	Wadsworth
Couzens	Heflin	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Howell	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Philips	Warren
Dale	Johnson, Minn.	Pittman	Watson
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Ralston	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Ransdell	Willis

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL], is unavoidably absent. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. PEPPER. I desire to announce that my colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], is unavoidably absent from the Chamber. I request that this announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 698. An act for the relief of the Great Lakes engineering works;

S. 831. An act for the relief of H. B. Stout;

S. 1427. An act for the relief of Rosa L. Yarbrough;

S. 1568. An act for the relief of certain officers in the United States Army;

S. 1605. An act for the relief of Emma Kiener;

S. 1894. An act for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Kin-Dave*;

S. 1976. An act for the relief of the Commercial Union Assurance Co. (Ltd.), Federal Insurance Co., American & Foreign Marine Insurance Co., Queen Insurance Co. of America, Fireman's Fund Insurance Co., St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co., and the United States Lloyds;

S. 2316. An act to allow credit in the accounts of A. W. Smith;

S. 2526. An act providing for an allotment of land from the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation, Okla., to James F. Rowell, an intermarried and enrolled member of the Kiowa Tribe;

S. 2669. An act for the relief of J. R. King;

S. 2689. An act for the relief of the First International Bank of Sweetgrass, Mont.;

S. 2711. An act for the relief of the Pitt River Power Co.;

S. 2764. An act authorizing the President to order Leo P. Quinn before a retiring board for a rehearing of his case and, upon the findings of such board, either confirm his discharge or place him on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his discharge;

S. 3073. An act for the relief of George A. Berry;

S. 3416. An act to authorize the appointment of Thomas James Camp as a major of Infantry, Regular Army; and

S. 3505. An act for the relief of Canadian Car & Foundry Co. (Ltd.).

The message also announced that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8235), for the relief of Aktieselskabet Marie di Giorgio, a Norwegian corporation of Christiania, Norway.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1199) authorizing the appointment of William Schuyler Woodruff as an Infantry officer, United States Army, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (S. 51) for the relief of the owner of the schooner *Itasca* and her master and crew; and

A bill (S. 1975) for the relief of the Commercial Union Assurance Co. (Ltd.), Federal Insurance Co., American & Foreign Marine Insurance Co., Queen Insurance Co. of America, Fireman's Fund Insurance Co., United States Lloyds, and the St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co.

The message also announced that the House had passed bills of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of the State Bank & Trust Co. of Fayetteville, Tenn.;

H. R. 1343. An act for the relief of Edward A. Grimes;

H. R. 1699. An act for the relief of B. G. Oosterbaan;

H. R. 5143. An act for the relief of First Lieut. John I. Conroy;

H. R. 5170. An act providing for an exchange of lands between Anton Hiersche and the United States in connection with the North Platte Federal irrigation project;

H. R. 5705. An act for the reimbursement of certain persons for loss of Liberty bonds and Victory notes while naval general court-martial prisoners;

H. R. 5752. An act for the relief of George A. Petrie;

H. R. 5779. An act to place John P. Holland on the retired list of the United States Navy;

H. R. 6695. An act authorizing the owners of the steamship *Malta Maru* to bring suit against the United States of America;

H. R. 6755. An act granting six months' pay to Maude Morrow Fechteler;

H. R. 7118. An act for the relief of the Mechanics & Metals National Bank, successor to the New York Produce Exchange Bank;

H. R. 7631. An act for the relief of Charles T. Clayton and others;

H. R. 7679. An act for the relief of Lars O. Elstad and his assigns and the exchange of certain lands owned by the Northern Pacific Railway Co.;

H. R. 7780. An act for the relief of Fred J. La May;

H. R. 7825. An act for the relief of William C. Gray;

H. R. 8072. An act for the relief of Emma Zembsch;

H. R. 8163. An act for the relief of John J. Dobbertin;

H. R. 8234. An act for the relief of Fayette L. Froemke;

H. R. 8298. An act for the relief of Byron S. Adams;

H. R. 8329. An act for the relief of Albert S. Matlock;

H. R. 8727. An act for the relief of Roger Sherman Hoar;

H. R. 8741. An act for the relief of Flora M. Herrick;

H. R. 9027. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent to William G. Johnson certain lands in Louisiana;

H. R. 9131. An act for the relief of Martha Janowitz;

H. R. 9204. An act granting six months' pay to Constance D. Lathrop;

H. R. 9308. An act to authorize the appointment of Machinist Henry F. Mulloy, United States Navy, as an ensign in the regular Navy; and

H. R. 9461. An act for the relief of Lieut. Richard Evelyn Byrd, jr., United States Navy.

APPRECIATION OF TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR LODGE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from J. E. Lodge, a son of the late distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, acknowledging re-

ceipt of resolutions recently adopted by the Senate, which will be printed in the RECORD.

The communication is as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, FREER GALLERY OF ART,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1925.

GEORGE A. SANDERSON, Esq.,

Secretary United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: On behalf of my family and myself, I beg to thank you for the copy of the Senate resolutions of January 19, 1925, and to ask that you will convey to the Senate our grateful appreciation of the action they have taken in connection with the death of my father.

Very truly yours,

J. E. LODGE.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules and lists of papers, documents, etc., on the files of the Treasury Department not needed in the transaction of public business and having no permanent or historic value, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The President pro tempore appointed Mr. Smoot and Mr. Simmons members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and ordered that the Secretary notify the House of Representatives thereof.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. WILLIS presented the petition of Rev. R. E. Conrad and sundry members of the congregations of the Freeport and Antrim Presbyterian Churches, at Freeport, Ohio, praying for the passage of legislation providing for the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Cincinnati (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of legislation for the recognition and promotion of Master Sergt. Samuel Woodfill, United States Army, a conspicuous member of the American Expeditionary Forces during the World War, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Galena, Crawford County, Nekoma, and Topeka, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. NEELY presented a resolution unanimously adopted by the executive council of the West Virginia Bar Association at Charleston, W. Va., favoring the passage of legislation granting increased salaries to Federal judges, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOWELL presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wayne, Nebr., praying for the passage of the so-called Cramton bill, being House bill 6645, to amend the national prohibition act, to provide for a bureau of prohibition in the Treasury Department, to define its powers and duties, and to place its personnel under the civil service act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PEPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chester, Philadelphia, Haverford, and Pittsburgh, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of legislation to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constitution*, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. OWEN presented a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, favoring the passage of Senate bill 33, making eligible for retirement under certain conditions officers of the Army of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War, which was ordered to lie on the table. (See resolution presented by Mr. HARRELD, when printed in full in the proceedings of yesterday, p. 2266.)

Mr. WADSWORTH submitted the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

IN SENATE, STATE OF NEW YORK,

Albany, N. Y., January 12, 1925.

(By Mr. Byrne)

Whereas since the last session of the Legislature of the State of New York, as a result of an organized movement on the part of the citizens of the State of New York, the United States Army Board of Engineers for rivers and harbors officially approved of the project of deepening the channel of the Hudson River; and

Whereas at the last session of the legislature the senate and assembly did jointly adopt a resolution calling on the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to provide the authorization and necessary appropriation for the deepening of the said Hudson River; and

Whereas there has been a state-wide call for this project, indorsed by civic and semicivic organizations, clubs, fraternities, business and professional men, and organizations of citizens of various kinds; and

Whereas the action of the United States Army Engineers has been approved, in turn, by the Chief of the Army Engineers and the Secretary of War and has been transmitted, with their approval, by them through the proper channels to the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, and, in turn, reported favorably by this committee as a part of the rivers and harbors bill now before Congress, containing the authorization for this deeper Hudson project; and

Whereas the governor in his annual message has indorsed this project of deepening the Hudson River, setting forth that the measure is for State and national economies in transportation; that it is immensely important to every community in the State and to the entire eastern seaboard of the United States that this natural geographical trade route, on which the Erie Canal built up the fortunes of the State of New York 100 years ago, be maintained and strengthened by such a measure; and that he further stated that this is not a partisan matter, but a business proposition, and should be kept free of politics in its every aspect, and that its importance to the State justified consideration by the legislature: Therefore be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation now before it which will provide the authorization, and subsequently to provide the necessary appropriation, for the deepening of the Hudson River to provide for the continuation of a 27-foot channel from the lower river to the capitol district adequate for deep-sea freighters, thus creating an inland port which will relieve surplus pressure of commerce on the port of New York and hold the channel of the future trade of the United States through its logical eastern water-level route to the Atlantic coast; and that we do hereby call upon the representatives of the State of New York in the United States Senate and House of Representatives to do their utmost to see that favorable action is taken at once on this highly important and vitally necessary legislation; and be it further.

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Clerk of the United States Senate and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State.

By order of the senate:

ERNEST A. FAY, Clerk.

IN ASSEMBLY, January 13, 1925.

Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the assembly:

FRED W. HAMMOND, Clerk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. CAMERON, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 172) to authorize the appropriation of certain amounts for the Yuma irrigation project, Arizona, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 907) thereon.

Mr. RALSTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1931) amending the Army appropriation act approved July 9, 1918, providing for appointment and retirement of officers of the Medical Reserve Corps, or contract surgeons, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 908) thereon.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5417) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to investigate the feasibility, and to ascertain and report the cost of establishing a national military park in and about Kansas City, Mo., commemorative of the Battle of Westport, October 23, 1864, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 909) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3977) to authorize the Secretary of War to reappoint and immediately discharge or retire certain warrant officers of the Army Mine Planter Service, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 911) thereon.

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 3772) to authorize the reduction of and to fix the rate of interest to be paid by carriers upon notes or other evidences of indebtedness heretofore issued under the provisions of section 207 of the transportation act, 1920, or section 210 of said act, as amended by an act approved June 5, 1920, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. STANFIELD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3682) for the relief of M. Barde & Sons (Inc.), Portland, Oreg., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 912) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8522) granting to certain claimants the preference right to purchase unappropriated public lands, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 913) thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3818) authorizing the construction of additional facilities at Walter Reed General Hospital, in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 914) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3400) for the purchase of the tract of land adjoining the militia target range at Auburn, Me., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 915) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3669) to provide for the inspection of the battle fields of the siege of Petersburg, Va., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 916) thereon.

CHANGES OF REFERENCE

Mr. WADSWORTH. The bill (S. 2010) for the relief of Mrs. Gill I. Wilson was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs through an error. After consultation with the introducer, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the members of the Committee on Military Affairs I ask unanimous consent that that committee be discharged from its further consideration and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ASHURST. The bill (H. R. 4114) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Colorado River near Lee Ferry, Ariz., was erroneously referred to the Committee on Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from its further consideration and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. WATSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that January 22, 1925, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 387. An act to prescribe the method of capital punishment in the District of Columbia;

S. 625. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Batesville, Ark.;

S. 3292. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Hannibal, Mo., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Hannibal, Marion County, Mo.;

S. 3428. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River to connect the city of Portsmouth, Ohio, and the village of Fullerton, Ky.;

S. 3610. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near Arrow Rock, Mo.;

S. 3611. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near St. Charles, Mo.;

S. 3621. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Monroe, La.;

S. 3622. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew at each of the following-named points in Morehouse Parish, La.: Vester Ferry, Ward Ferry, and Zachary Ferry;

S. 3642. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River at Kettle Falls, Wash.;

S. 3643. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Ambridge and Woodlawn, Beaver County, Pa.;

S. 3733. An act to enlarge the powers of the Washington Hospital for Foundlings and to enable it to accept the devise and bequest contained in the will of Randolph T. Warwick; and

S. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to accept the gift of Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge for the construction of an auditorium in connection with the Library of Congress, and to provide for the erection thereof.

WABASH RIVER BRIDGE, INDIANA

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I report back favorably with amendments from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 3722) to authorize the States of Indiana and Illinois in the States of Indiana and Illinois to construct a bridge across the Wabash River at the city of Vincennes, Knox County, Ind., and connecting Lawrence County, Ill., and I submit a report (No. 910) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 4, after the name "Illinois," to strike out "connecting the two States, is" and insert "are"; in line 9, after the word "navigation," to strike out "at a place near a bridge now in operation and heretofore constructed by said Knox County at said point on the Federal transcontinental highway, known as the Midland Trail, between Vincennes, Ind., and St. Louis, Mo., all," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Knox, State of Indiana, and county of Lawrence, State of Illinois, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Wabash River from a point in the city of Vincennes, Knox County, Ind., to a point in Lawrence County, in the State of Illinois, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the county of Knox, State of Indiana, and the county of Lawrence, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across the Wabash River at the city of Vincennes, Knox County, Ind."

WHITE RIVER BRIDGE, ARKANSAS

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 3884) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Independence, Ark., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the White River at or near the city of Batesville, in the county of Independence, in the State of Arkansas, and I submit a report (No. 917) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the county of Independence, in the State of Arkansas, and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the White River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the city of Batesville, in the county of Independence, in the State of Arkansas, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAVANNAH RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 11168) granting the consent of Congress to S. M. McAdams, of Iva, Anderson County, S. C., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River, and I submit a report (No. 918) thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILL:

A bill (S. 4046) to curb and prevent fraudulent practices affecting real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

A bill (S. 4047) granting a pension to Elizabeth J. Hawron; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 4048) for the relief of Luther Hansford Phipps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 4049) for the relief of John H. Poe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 4050) for the relief of Herman Shulof; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 4051) granting a pension to Mary E. Kester; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4052) authorizing and directing the President to accept lands for naval air station at Sand Point, Wash.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

A bill (S. 4053) granting an increase of pension to Floyd A. Honaker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEFLIN:

A bill (S. 4054) for the relief of the owner of the tug *Basco*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of Missouri:

A bill (S. 4055) granting an increase of pension to James W. Fisher (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COUZENS:

A bill (S. 4056) to provide for an additional district judge for the western district of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 173) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to establish a trust fund for the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians in Oklahoma, and making provision for the same; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MINERAL LANDS IN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 876) to provide for the disposition of bonuses, rentals, and royalties received under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920, from unallotted lands in Executive order Indian reservations, and for other purposes, which was, on page 2, after line 8, to insert the following:

That the provisions of said act approved February 25, 1920, shall apply to unallotted lands within Indian reservations, except that such lands may only be leased and patents shall not be issued for the same.

That the production of minerals on said lands may be taxed by the State wherein the same are produced in all respects the same as minerals produced on privately owned lands, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be paid from out of the tribal funds in the Treasury the tax so assessed: *Provided*, That such tax shall not become a lien or charge of any kind or character against the land or other property of such Indians.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby authorized an appropriation of \$15,000 from the money on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Navajo Tribe of Indians derived from bonuses on oil and gas leases, and from oil and gas royalties, for expenditure, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, for necessary expenses in connection with the supervision of the development and operation of the oil and gas industry on the Navajo Indian Reservation in Arizona and New Mexico.

SEC. 3. That the provisions of this act shall not apply to the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

LANDS IN ARIZONA, NEW MEXICO, AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. ASHURST. I ask that the Chair kindly lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 369) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913. I wish to move that the Senate concur in the House amendment. The bill passed the Senate and later passed the House with one amendment. I think it came over with a message on yesterday or the day before.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 369) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California."

nia," approved March 4, 1913, which was on page 1, line 8, to strike out "1925" and insert the following: "1927."

Mr. ASHURST. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by title and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 5170. An act providing for an exchange of lands between Anton Hiersche and the United States in connection with the North Platte Federal irrigation project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 7780. An act for the relief of Fred J. La May; and H. R. 9027. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent to William G. Johnson certain lands in Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 1343. An act for the relief of Edward A. Grimes; H. R. 5143. An act for the relief of First Lieut. John I. Conroy;

H. R. 5779. An act to place John P. Holland on the retired list of the United States Navy;

H. R. 6755. An act granting six months' pay to Maude Morrow Fechteler;

H. R. 7825. An act for the relief of William C. Gray; H. R. 8072. An act for the relief of Emma Zembsch; H. R. 8169. An act for the relief of John J. Dobbertin; H. R. 8234. An act for the relief of Fayette L. Froemke; H. R. 9204. An act granting six months' pay to Constance D. Lathrop;

H. R. 9308. An act to authorize the appointment of Machinist Henry F. Mulloy, United States Navy, as an ensign in the Regular Navy; and

H. R. 9461. An act for the relief of Lieut. Richard Evelyn Byrd, jr., United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of the State Bank & Trust Co., of Fayetteville, Tenn.;

H. R. 1699. An act for the relief of B. G. Oosterbaan; H. R. 5705. An act for the reimbursement of certain persons for loss of Liberty bonds and Victory notes while naval general court-martial prisoners;

H. R. 5752. An act for the relief of George A. Petrie; H. R. 6695. An act authorizing the owners of the steamship *Malta Maru* to bring suit against the United States of America;

H. R. 7118. An act for the relief of the Mechanics & Metals National Bank, successor to the New York Produce Exchange Bank;

H. R. 7631. An act for the relief of Charles T. Clayton and others;

H. R. 8298. An act for the relief of Byron S. Adams; H. R. 8329. An act for the relief of Albert S. Matlock; H. R. 8727. An act for the relief of Roger Sherman Hoar; H. R. 8741. An act for the relief of Flora M. Herrick; and H. R. 9131. An act for the relief of Martha Janowitz; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RAILROADS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the report of the Director General of Railroads and Agent of the President for the year ended December 31, 1924, together with his final report as to adjustments of the claims of carriers whose property was taken over and actually operated by the Government during the 26 months of Federal control.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1925.

RETIREMENT OF WORLD WAR OFFICERS

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I move that the bill (S. 33) making eligible for retirement under certain conditions officers of the Army of the United States, other than officers of the Regular Army, who incurred physical disability in line of duty while in the service of the United States during the World War, be made a special order for Tuesday next at 2 o'clock.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico moves that Senate bill 33 be made a special order for Tuesday next at 2 o'clock. The motion is not subject to debate. The Senator from Utah will state the inquiry.

Mr. KING. Is it in order, when a measure is under consideration as a special order, to supersede it or to suspend the consideration of that special order by a motion to make another bill a special order for some particular time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that it is in order, as he expressed yesterday. The last paragraph of Rule X so provides.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not open to debate.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire will state the inquiry.

Mr. MOSES. In the event of entertaining the motion made by the Senator from New Mexico and its adoption, will it displace the business now before the Senate under the special order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that it will not displace the business before the Senate.

Mr. MOSES. And the pending question, the point or order, goes on?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question goes on, standing precisely as it does now.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia will state the inquiry.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senate took an adjournment and we had had a morning hour, the ruling of the Chair, it seems to me, would be correct; but having taken a recess, we are in the legislative day of yesterday, and having no morning hour to-day it seems to me the motion, if it prevails, will displace the unfinished business which is now a special order. It appears to me also that the motion would be subject to debate for the simple reason that a motion made at this time when the Senate meets after a recess is considered as having been made after the morning hour of the legislative day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The last paragraph of Rule X specially provides that the motion is not subject to debate.

Mr. KING. Is the motion subject to amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not subject to amendment.

Mr. KING. Is not the motion subject to amendment as to fixing the time when the bill shall be made a special order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is in doubt about that, but will hold for the moment that it is not subject to amendment.

Mr. KING. I will make the motion anyway. I move to amend the motion submitted by the Senator from New Mexico by striking out the word "Tuesday" and inserting "Saturday of next week."

Mr. BURSUM. I will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is accepted. All who are in favor of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico as modified by the suggestion of the Senator from Utah will say "aye." Those opposed "no." The noes have it, and the motion is not agreed to.

Mr. KING. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The difficulty is that many Senators did not vote on the motion and the Chair declared the result on the vote that was actually cast.

Mr. BURSUM. I did not understand the decision of the Chair. What was the decision of the Chair?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The decision of the Chair was that the noes had it, and the motion was not agreed to.

Mr. BURSUM. That was on the amendment, was it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico accepted the amendment, and the Chair stated that the question was on the motion as made by the Senator from New Mexico modified by the suggestion of the Senator from Utah. The Chair is not to blame because many Senators did not vote.

Mr. BURSUM. I ask for a division or a roll call.

Mr. KING. I submit that it is too late.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the demand comes too late.

Mr. KING. Regular order!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is Senate bill 3674, and it will be proceeded with.

POSTAL SALARIES AND POSTAL RATES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting

their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the point of order raised by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

Mr. STERLING. Will the Chair state the point of order, so that all Senators may understand it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia raises the point of order that Title II of the bill down to section 217 is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, which requires that revenue measures shall originate in the House of Representatives. The question is, Shall the point of order raised by the Senator from Virginia be sustained?

Mr. HEFLIN. On that question I call for the yeas and nays. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays were ordered yesterday upon the question.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to submit a very few observations touching the validity of the point of order which has been made against the portion of the pending bill which the Chair just specified.

Of course, I am aware that in the last analysis the House of Representatives may determine the question in any particular case, because if it chooses to regard a measure originating in the Senate as being a bill for raising revenue it may refuse to consider the bill and the Senate has no recourse. On the other hand, I apprehend that we should not anticipate that the House in any particular case will act in capricious fashion, but will desire merely to stand upon its constitutional prerogatives. Therefore I take it that the Senate should not act in mere slavish apprehension of what the House may do, but should seek, if possible, to work out a test of its own and apply that test in deciding such a point of order as this one.

Mr. President, after having listened most attentively to the argument by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and those who have suggested considerations on that side of the proposition, I submit that clearly the test is not whether the bill under consideration produces revenue which is covered into the Treasury. Whatever the test may be, it seems to me clear that that is not the test. I think that becomes almost demonstrable if one considers a few illustrations of different measures which have been or may be before this body.

Take, Mr. President, the case in which a bill authorizes the sale of land. The proceeds of the sale are covered into the Treasury. It is clear that that is not a revenue measure, but that the Government in that case is acting not as a sovereign but as a proprietor and is receiving the consideration which comes from parting with the thing owned.

Take, if you please, Mr. President, the case of a lease of Government property or the grant of a power privilege—the lease, for example, of the Muscle Shoals project, or whatever the case may be. It is perfectly true that money will come as the result of the proprietary grant; that the money will be covered into the Treasury and will become the subject of appropriation; but such a bill is not, within the meaning of the Constitution, a bill to raise revenue.

Take the case, Mr. President, of a criminal code, which prescribes what shall constitute crimes and offenses and the penalties for the infraction of its provisions. The fines and penalties are covered into the Treasury; but no one will be bold enough to contend that, being in the Treasury and subject to appropriation for the general purposes of government, therefore a criminal act imposing fines and penalties is a bill to raise revenue.

I suggest, Mr. President, the case of the creation of an office by statute and the prescribing of fees and charges which may be exacted for service rendered in the office, as, for instance, an act to establish a pension office and to fix the fees payable by those using the facilities of the pension office. That would not be a bill to raise revenue.

An act regulating the rate to be charged on a public utility—as, for example, a railroad owned by the Government—has the effect of producing revenue for the Treasury; but I submit, sir, that such a bill, within the meaning of the Constitution, is not a bill to raise revenue.

In the present case, as I think was well suggested by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] yesterday, what we have is not the exercise of sovereignty by the Government, which is the thing against which the Constitution protects the people by placing its original determination in the hands of the most numerous branch of the National Legislature, but it is an act of proprietorship in which the Government sells service, and the resulting payment which comes into the Treasury is not revenue within the sense of the constitutional provision that we are discussing.

What is the test which the Senate should apply? Mr. President, clearly the test is not the mere fact that money is raised and that it goes into the Treasury. I apprehend that the true test, in the first place, is this: No bill is a bill for the purpose of raising revenue unless it is a bill to raise a tax, a duty, an impost, or an excise. Those are the methods specified in the Constitution for raising the revenue of the Government, and, I repeat, no bill is a revenue bill which does not lay a tax, a duty, an impost, or an excise.

The reason is obvious. A tax, Mr. President, is a charge levied against the person or the property of an individual, otherwise than as a penalty for a crime, for the purpose of providing the Government with money with which to operate. That is a tax. It is an exaction of sovereignty. An impost or a duty is a charge which is assessed in respect of goods brought in from abroad. An excise is a charge made against those inland activities which the Government sees fit to make tributary to the Treasury.

All those are methods of raising revenue; they are exactions of sovereignty, and against the abuse of those powers the people need protection. The kind of protection that is given them is to require the bills raising revenue in the those ways shall originate in the House of Representatives, which is supposed to be more closely in touch with popular sentiment.

On the other hand, Mr. President, there are many varieties of ways in which money may be raised and flow into the Treasury which have no relation whatever to the raising of revenue in the constitutional sense. All the cases which I have mentioned by way of illustration are examples of measures that produce money for the Treasury but are not revenue measures within the meaning of the Constitution.

So I venture to suggest that the Senate in acting upon this matter should be guided by the following two principles: First, that no measure is a bill for raising revenue unless it lays a tax, an impost, a duty, or an excise; and, second, that it by no means follows that merely because a bill does lay a tax, a duty, an impost, or an excise, therefore it is a revenue measure; for, while it is not germane to the present discussion because we are considering a bill which lays no one of those exactions, it is settled by authority that even tax bills may not be revenue measures or measures to raise revenue in the constitutional sense if it so be that the revenue production is incidental to some other purpose of Government which is the primary object of the bill.

I have in mind the case in which all the property of the District of Columbia was subjected to an assessment to raise a fund for the purpose of meeting in part the expenses of the Union Station. That was clearly a tax bill, but it was held by the Supreme Court not to be, within the meaning of the Constitution, a bill raising revenue. I have in mind, by way of distinction, the case cited yesterday by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] to the effect that where the postal-order system was set up and fees were authorized to be charged by deputy postmasters for the service rendered in the office, while that was a measure which produced money it was in no sense a revenue-producing measure within the meaning of the Constitution.

There are tax bills discussed in the cases, confessedly tax bills, as in the national bank case, in which the court said that the taxation feature was incidental merely to the principal purpose of the legislation, and therefore the bill was not one to raise revenue.

But, Mr. President, I lay aside as not germane to this case the cases in which taxes, imposts, duties, and excises are levied not primarily for the purpose of revenue. Having done so, I venture to assert that there is no case decided by respectable authority in which it has been held that a bill is a bill to raise revenue unless it is a bill levying a tax, an impost, a duty, or an excise.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Would the Senator's interpretation extend to the authority of the Senate to fix the salaries of Government officials? Could we originate a bill here fixing the salaries of various officials of the Government?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I take it that that raises the question which has been long in debate between the Senate and the House, which even gives rise to the question whether appropriation bills may originate here.

Mr. FESS. That is another question.

Mr. PEPPER. I am aware of the existence of that conflict of opinion between the two bodies; but I beg the Senator to focus attention upon the proposition immediately before us, which is whether the Senate should take its stand upon the constitutional proposition that no measure is one beyond its jurisdiction unless it is a measure which lays or levies a tax, an impost, a duty, or an excise. I say, if it were necessary, I should be prepared to point out that there are cases where measures are tax measures and yet are not measures raising revenue in the constitutional sense. But this is not a tax case, and so it is not necessary to discuss that question.

I submit, however, that we ought not, merely upon the suggestion that the House of Representatives will refuse to consider our bill, slavishly recede from the assertion of what I believe to be the constitutional rights of the Senate. I feel somewhat jealous, Mr. President, of the preservation of our constitutional rights in this body, and I venture to hope that Senators will look beyond the immediate implications of the pending question and deal with it as one affecting the dignity and prerogatives of the Senate. I press for an acceptance of that view, Mr. President, with all the earnestness of which I am capable.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I am of the opinion that the comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania should be given considerable attention because of the necessity of maintaining the dignity of this body. I give that phase of the suggestion full respect. He did raise the question that was in my mind as to the right of this body to initiate appropriation bills; and also as to its right to originate general legislation fixing the salaries of Government officials. Those two are mooted questions. I think that the strongest argument that has yet been presented on either side of that issue was presented by John Sharp Williams, when a Senator in this body, on July 15, 1912. The opinion of Senator Williams would always carry great weight because of his ability generally, and especially with reference to an issue such as this. I commend the reading of that address to every Member of the Senate. It is too long for me to quote from it, other than simply to call attention to the argument ex-Senator Williams made that that is not a power that this body can initiate.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. FESS. I do.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator state to the Senate the general position taken by Senator Williams, and some of the essential arguments upon which he based his conclusion?

Mr. FESS. The Senator will be glad to make a statement of the source of ex-Senator Williams's argument.

The subject had been running as a subject of debate for much time, and he took occasion to go over the sources, going back to the Constitutional Convention, and quoting very profusely from the fathers, including Mr. Pinckney, whose opinion would carry great weight, Hamilton, Madison, and Yates.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. Was the bill before the Senate, upon which Senator Williams spoke, a revenue bill?

Mr. FESS. It was an appropriation bill; and the Senator asked the privilege of inserting in the Record his findings, after having taken much time to collect them from the original sources, and they are here before me. He quotes the opinion from the famous Judge Iredell, of the State of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, one of the great judges of our early history; also quoting the opinion of the Pinckneys. If I may be permitted, I should like to read just one statement:

That all bills for raising or appropriating money and for fixing the salaries of the officers of the Government of the United States shall originate in the first branch of the Legislature, and shall not be altered or amended by the second branch.

That was the original proposal. It was modified by striking out the latter part, "shall not be altered." I do not want to take the time of the Senate to repeat the various citations, but simply call the attention of the membership of the Senate to the article, that they may enlarge on it if they desire.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, did Senator Williams hold that the Senate could not modify appropriation bills?

Mr. FESS. No; he did not.

Now, as to the other suggestion of our respecting the action of the House, I think it is proper that we should take into consideration what is to be the immediate result of this legis-

lation if we send it to the House. The matter came up in the House in 1859. I read from Hinds' Precedents, volume 2, section 1485:

The Senate having insisted on its right to add a revenue amendment to an appropriation bill, the House declined to proceed further with the bill.

Instance of a conference over the prerogatives of the two Houses respecting revenue legislation.

* * * * *

On March 3, 1859, Mr. Galusha A. Grow * * *

Of the State of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania—

as a question of privilege offered this resolution:

"Resolved, That House bill No. 872, making appropriations for defraying the expenses of the Post Office Department for the year ending 30th June, 1860, with the Senate amendments thereto, be returned to the Senate, as section 13 of said amendments is in the nature of a revenue measure."

Mr. Grow explained that section 13 raised the rate of postage.

Mr. John S. Phelps, of Missouri, contended that the revenue bills which should originate only in the House were such only as were contemplated in this clause of the Constitution.

That is the contention of those who have spoken in favor of this body having the ability to do what we propose to do, that that power was conveyed in this clause:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises."

The question being taken, the resolution was agreed to—yeas 116, nays 78.

The resolution of the House having been received in the Senate, Mr. John J. Crittenden, of Kentucky, proposed the following resolutions, which were agreed to:

"Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Senate and House, being of right equally competent, each to judge of the propriety and constitutionality of its own action, the Senate has exercised said right in its action on the amendments sent to the House, leaving to the House its right to adopt or reject each of said amendments at its pleasure."

That was the contention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] just a moment ago.

"Resolved, That this resolution be communicated to the House of Representatives, and that the bill and amendments aforesaid be transmitted therewith."

That was the action of this body.

This message, with the bill and amendments, having been received in the House, a motion to take them up under suspension of the rules failed—yeas 94, nays 85.

The House, therefore, rejected the proposal to take them up.

That is only one incident touching this subject. There are many others. There are two specific instances that cover precisely this point that we have, both of them on the postal increase. The second was raised by Uncle Joe Cannon, afterwards the Speaker of that body.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, that is the very case cited by Roscoe Conkling in a celebrated opinion he gave as to the right of the House to make appropriations. It has been contended that the Senate could not make appropriations.

Mr. FESS. So I understand.

Mr. OVERMAN. And his opinion was written on that subject, and in so far as levying taxes are concerned Roscoe Conkling quotes this very case in the case I quoted yesterday.

Mr. FESS. In other words, Mr. President, we have two precedents that cover precisely the question we have before us, limited to the raising of postage rates, and there is not a bit of doubt about the outcome of this thing if we send it to the House. Some Member of the 435 will raise the point of order. Here are two precedents specifically on the subject, and the House does not reverse its precedents. That has been my understanding, at least, in my service in that body.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I wondered if the question was not raised in either one or both of these cases as to a consideration of the matter by the House in Committee of the Whole. As I remember, the House had a rule, and I think the rule still prevails, to the effect that certain measures must be considered by the House in Committee of the Whole; and is it not

possible that the action of the House was based on the fact that the measure had not been considered in the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. FESS. I will say to my friend the Senator from South Dakota that that is not the point. It is true that all public bills that provide for an appropriation or expenditure of money must be considered in the Committee of the Whole in the House; but that was not the question that was raised here. My only concern about the matter is that we are raising a question that I am perfectly certain will be futile, for if we send this bill to the House a point of order will be raised, and the bill will not be considered. It is true that the House then can proceed to take up the bill *ab initio*; but I think the proper thing to do would be to have the bill originate in the House where it belongs. Then, when it comes over here, we can amend it if we see fit to do so.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator—who for so many years and so ably has defended the prerogatives of the House that he is not yet accustomed to defending the prerogatives of the Senate—if it be not true that in the House, under the rule, appropriations may not be made for commissions appointed without authority of law?

Mr. FESS. I do not know of any case of that sort. Is the Senator's question as to appropriating for commissions in the House without authority of law? There is no such practice over there.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator knows that within the last fortnight the House has appropriated to that end.

Mr. FESS. If anybody had made the point of order, it would not have been done. The House evidently did it in ignorance of the fact that there was no existing law on the subject.

Mr. McCORMICK. No, Mr. President, I think if the Senator will inquire he will find that they did it under the persuasion of some of the leaders of the House that that would be the prudent and the politic course to follow in the interest of the public welfare.

Mr. FESS. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I can not conceive of the possibility of the House knowingly appropriating money without authority. I can not conceive of the possibility of that; and if there had not been any authority I also can not conceive of an appropriation bill in the House writing in the bill legislation which would not pass a point of order.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, unless my memory be at fault the appropriation was made by amendment in the Senate, and leaders of the House persuaded the Members of the House to acquiesce in that appropriation for the maintenance of a commission which exists without any authority of law.

Mr. FESS. I catch the point of the Senator now. Whenever the Senate puts on a bill through an amendment that which would have been without authority in the House, or would have been subject to a point of order in the House, the House can not act upon that without a separate vote.

Mr. SMOOT. That is only under the rules of the House.

Mr. FESS. That is what I mean, under the rules of the House. That is what we are talking about.

Mr. McCORMICK. In this case, unless I am misinformed, there was no separate vote.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. FESS. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. So that we may have accurate information, I wish the Senator from Illinois would give that instance.

Mr. McCORMICK. Certainly; I shall seek the information at the first opportunity. I was informed yesterday that the amended bill sent over there was accepted without any separate vote on the items in question.

Mr. NORRIS. Was that a vote for an appropriation?

Mr. McCORMICK. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. That is different from a vote for an amendment raising revenue, to begin with. There is not any constitutional prohibition against the Senate originating an appropriation.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. To emphasize still further the position taken by the Senator from Ohio and also the suggestion made by the Senator from North Carolina, let me suggest that all of these rates were fixed in a revenue act which is now existing, the act of 1917, passed by both bodies of Congress and signed

by the President. This is an effort to repeal, abolish, or modify what has been decided by both the House and the Senate in fixing these rates in the revenue act of 1917. The Constitution provides that the Senate may concur in a revenue bill with amendments, but, as suggested by the Senator from North Carolina yesterday, there is an effort now to repeal in the Senate what has been conceded by both bodies to be a revenue act.

Mr. FESS. I yield now to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I merely desire to address an inquiry to the Senator from Ohio, from the point of view of friendliness to the legislation now pending and with a regard for the maintenance of the prerogatives of the Senate. Does not the Senator think that there is a great deal to be said in favor of the last suggestion which he himself made in his opening remarks, that we should turn down this point of order, maintain the position of the Senate, send the bill to the House, and, if the House refuses to consider it, the House will proceed, as the Senator suggests, to originate a companion or substitute measure of its own? This is my question: From the point of view of the Senate, should we not act upon the principle which I attempted to outline a few moments ago and let the House take the responsibility of rejecting our action if it sees fit?

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I want to be very frank in my reply to the Senator. This point of order is a source of considerable embarrassment to the friends of the measure in that if the point of order is sustained and it is limited to Title II, this body will have before it exactly the same bill which was vetoed by the President, precisely, without any modification.

Mr. WILLIS and Mr. REED of Missouri addressed the Chair.

Mr. FESS. This body will be facing a situation of going up hill one day and down the next, which nobody wants to do.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. FESS. I will yield in just a moment. I have insisted that the point of order should go to the legislation, should go to the entire bill, and if sustained, the bill will be away from this body, instead of having the point of order apply to the point to which the author has limited it. I recognize, as any other Member here does, that I can make a point of order to a word in a bill, and if sustained the word will go out and leave the bill; or to a clause, or to a title. I can also make a point of order to the whole bill, because it contains that which is out of order, and if the point of order is sustained, the bill will leave us. That is the contention I have been insisting upon, but I have not been able to convince the President of this body that, with the point of order of my friend the Senator from Virginia, now pending, the larger point of order, going to the entire bill, which includes everything, would be in order.

I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply wanted to refer to the remarks made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. He claims that because of the fact that an amendment fixing rates was made to an appropriation bill, that made it a revenue measure. That is the position the Senator took, or at least I understood the Senator to say that.

Mr. SWANSON. The revenue act of 1917, as I understand it—

Mr. SMOOT. No, it was a Post Office appropriation bill to which the Senator referred, and if that is the case, I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that few appropriation bills ever pass this body without legislation being put upon them. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] was correct when he said that such legislation has to be acted upon separately in the House, under the rules of the House. There is no doubt about that. But the mere fact that the House agrees to it, and agrees that under their rule it should be a part of that particular bill, does not make that item or amendment a revenue bill, because few appropriation bills ever pass without legislation of that kind on it. I hold in my hand the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926. I think there are at least four or five items in the bill of exactly the character I have described. Does the Senator mean that hereafter, if there shall be legislation in Congress upon the items in an appropriation bill, it must originate in the House? That would be intolerable.

Mr. SWANSON and Mr. WILLIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FESS. I yield first to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand it—and if I am mistaken I would like to have the Senator correct me—the revenue act of 1917 for all purposes fixed these postal rates, too.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, as I stated on yesterday, one of the revenue acts—I do not recall now which one—provided for an increase in the postage rate upon letters, raising it from 2 cents to 3 cents. That went into effect and continued in effect until subsequently repealed in another revenue act. That is what I stated yesterday.

Mr. FESS. Now I yield to my colleague.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I simply wanted to call the attention of my colleague to a rather famous case which came from the State of Ohio, and to ask whether he has considered the court's decision in that case.

As I recall the case, the title was *Laylin* against the Southern Gum Co. The Senator will remember that the Legislature of Ohio passed an act levying what in common parlance was called a "tax" upon certain corporations, domestic corporations and foreign corporations, in proportion to their capital stock. The Senator will remember that that was contested by the corporations on the theory that it was a tax. The case ran through all the courts and finally came here to the Supreme Court, as I recall it, and it was held that that was not a tax, that the bill was not a revenue bill, that the purpose of it was to require these corporations to pay a fee for a service. It seemed that the fee paid was rather out of harmony with the amount of service rendered.

The Senator knows that the law in question brings in, perhaps, a million and a half dollars per year; but the court held, and it is still the holding of the court, never having been reversed, that that was not a revenue measure, but a measure intended to collect a fee for a service, and that therefore the provision of the Constitution touching revenue bills did not apply.

With great respect for my colleague's argument, it seems to me that that applies to the instant case, in that this is not a revenue bill, but is a measure intended to collect, as it were, a fee for a service, and therefore the provision of the Constitution in question does not apply. It is my understanding that the pending measure is not a revenue bill, but that it proposes in effect to provide for the collection of certain fees and charges for service rendered. I think, therefore, that the point of order should not be sustained.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I must say to my colleague that both he and I voted against this measure when it was originally in the Senate because it did not provide the revenue. Now we do provide the revenue, and I am inclined to vote for the bill, it having that provision in it. Everybody knows that the Constitution does not use the word "taxes" in this connection, but uses the word "revenue," and that anything that goes into the Treasury, out of which or from which it can only be taken by legislative action, is revenue. Whether or not it is revenue in the sense in which that word is used in the Constitution, where it provides that all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House, is a question of dispute here, it seems; but there is no doubt in my mind, and for that reason I shall have to vote to sustain the point of order.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, my colleague understands that I agree with him that while in effect this is revenue, it is really a payment for a service that is rendered by the Post Office Department, and that therefore it does not come under the general head of revenue, but rather is a fee.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not want to weary the Senate with further talk about this point of order, but I desire to call attention to a few authorities. As a preliminary, let me say that it is a strange doctrine which I have heard announced here this morning, that if a certain item happens to have been put in some ordinary revenue bill, for all time that fixes that class of thing as a revenue measure within the meaning of the Constitution. If that were true, we would better use a great deal of care hereafter, for nothing is more common than to find a revenue bill filled up with all sort of regulations, and with substantive law touching many questions.

The question whether this bill is a revenue bill within the meaning of the Constitution is the only question before us. If we shall decide that it is, we will deprive the Senate of a jurisdiction which it has constantly had since the formation of the Government. If we decide it upon narrow grounds because our desires in this particular case may run in a certain direction, we may find day after to-morrow that our desire runs the other way, and we will be confronted with the decision in which we have shorn ourselves of a jurisdiction granted to us by the Constitution.

Of course, absent the provision in the Constitution which declares that the House of Representatives must originate revenue bills, the Senate would have an equal jurisdiction, and the Senate's jurisdiction is coordinate with that of the House save and except as it is limited by that phrase of the Constitution, and that phrase of the Constitution has received construc-

tion by the courts and the authorities from the days of Story. It was Story who early used, if he did not originate, that expression construing the clause of the Constitution as referring strictly to taxes, and which has been read here several times.

I desire for a moment to call attention to the fact that the specific question we are now discussing has been decided by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. The opinion was by Judge Johnson, and he said:

The provision of the Constitution, which is claimed to render invalid the clause in question, is this: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments, as on other bills."

The court declares:

A bill regulating postal rates for postal service provides an equivalent for the money which the citizen may choose voluntarily to pay. He gets the fixed service for the fixed rate or he lets it alone, as he pleases and as his own interests dictate. Revenue beyond its cost may or may not be derived from the service and the pay received for it; but it is only a very strained construction which would regard a bill establishing rates of postage as a bill for raising revenue, within the meaning of the Constitution. This broad distinction existing, in fact, between the two kinds of bills, it is obviously a just construction to confine the terms of the Constitution to the case which they plainly designate. To strain those terms beyond their primary and obvious meaning and thus to introduce a precedent for that sort of construction would work a great public mischief. Mr. Justice Story, in his *Commentaries on the Constitution* (sec. 880), puts the same construction upon the language in question and gives his reasons for the views he sustains, which are able and convincing. In *Tucker's Blackstone* only, so far as authorities have been referred to, is found the opinion that a bill for establishing the post office operates as a revenue law. But this opinion, although put forth at an early day, has never obtained any general approval; but both legislative practice and general consent have concurred in the other view.

There is the case of *Smith v. Gillam* (282 Fed. Repts. 628), where the question arose touching the prohibition law. I read just a sentence:

* * * Previous adjudications have clearly established the proposition that the incidental receipt of money by the Government or its officers under the national prohibition act (41 Stat. 305) does not make it a "revenue law" within the meaning of such enactments as section 33 of the Judicial Code.

Here is a case in the One hundred and forty-ninth Federal Reporter, *Bryant Bros. against Robinson*, coming up from the fifth circuit. The case came up on a question of removal, and the court there said:

There is no decision of the Supreme Court decisive of the question as to whether this cause is removable under section 643. In *Public Clearing House v. Coyne*, 194 U. S. 497, 506, 24 Sup. Ct. 789, 48 L. Ed. 1092, the Supreme Court speaks of the Post Office Department as not being "a necessary part of the civil government in the same sense in which the protection of life, liberty, and property, the defense of the Government against insurrection and foreign invasion, and the administration of public justice, are; but is a public function assumed and established by Congress for the general welfare, and, in most countries, its expenses are paid solely by the persons making use of its facilities; and it returns, or is presumed to return, a revenue to the Government, and really operates as a public and efficient method of taxation." *United States v. Norton*, 91 U. S. 566, 23 L. Ed. 454, is cited as an authority against the application of the statute to this case. It holds that the act entitled "An act to establish a postal money-order system," approved May 17, 1864, c. 87, 13 Stat. 76, is not a revenue law within the meaning of the act entitled "An act in addition to the act entitled 'An act for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States,'" approved March 26, 1804, c. 40, 2 Stat. 290. *United States v. Hill*, 123 U. S. 681, 8 Sup. Ct. 308, 31 L. Ed. 275, contains expressions which confine the phrase "revenue law," when used in connection with the jurisdiction of the United States courts, to laws imposing duties on imports or tonnage, or a law providing in terms for revenue.

The case in Two hundred and second United States, *Millard against Roberts*, has already been cited. The case in One hundred and seven United States, *Twin City Bank against Nebeker*, has been cited and I shall not read it again. The case of *United States against Norton* has been cited and often referred to. There is a case in Arkansas by the supreme court of that State which holds that a special tax levied for the purpose of building bridges and highways is not a revenue law within the proper meaning of that term. There is a case of *Laughlin against County of Santa Fe*, decided by the Supreme Court of New Mexico, from which I read just a sentence:

Courts have frequently had occasion to construe similar phraseology, and, in such construction, they hold almost uniformly that the term "revenue," when used with reference to funds derived from taxation,

is best interpreted, in the absence of qualifying words or circumstances implying a different signification, as confined to the usual public income taxation.

I have found no case to the contrary. It seems to me too plain for argument. The exclusive authority granted to the House of Representatives to originate revenue bills, properly construed, gives to that body an exclusive jurisdiction over tax measures and does not apply in a case where a charge is fixed for a governmental service, even though the funds derived are turned into the General Treasury, where, in fact, are placed by the Government substantially all dues or fees or fines.

Let me illustrate: We have built a railroad in Alaska. Suppose we were to undertake in the Senate to pass a bill regulating or improving the service on the railroads in Alaska. Would anyone say we could not provide for the levying of proper charges on that road? The Panama Canal is an illustration. Tolls are charged for boats passing through the canal. Does anyone imagine that the Senate could not provide for the raising or lowering of those tolls? The lowering of a toll is the fixing of a lower rate, and there it is equally a revenue measure, if it be a revenue measure at all, with the raising of rates.

Now, it seems to me a vote upon this question for any narrow reason that we would like to put the bill in such shape that the House of Representatives would be forced to a particular action or that some tactical advantage could be gained here over the bill, is a mistake, because the precedent we establish will remain. If we establish a wrong precedent, it will be here to-morrow and the day after to-morrow and 10 years from now, and we may find an occasion when the Senate will regard it as highly necessary that it should exercise the power given to it by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he takes his seat?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have been very much impressed with the effectiveness and logic of the Senator's presentation, and I want to ask whether it is not true that the real distinction as indicated by the authorities which the Senator has cited is between those exactions which the Government makes in its capacity as sovereign and those charges which it makes when, as a proprietor, it sells property or as a renderer of service it sells services? Is not that distinction fundamental all through the cases which the Senator cited?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I think it is. But I go a little further than that. I believe that a careful examination will show that the provisions of the Constitution apply only to a general tax, strictly and absolutely a tax.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I have already occupied considerable time in the discussion of this question, and shall therefore be very brief. I just want to say a few words brought out by some statements made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] and by others, too. It seems to me that we only need to look at the terms of the bill and consider the things for which the bill provides in order to determine whether it is a revenue measure.

The Government, under the power given by the Constitution, has established post offices and post roads for the benefit of the public or that part of the public desiring to use postal facilities. It costs the Government, of course, to maintain those facilities, and it charges the people who use the facilities for the services rendered. In charging them for the services rendered, are we raising a revenue within the meaning of the Constitution, requiring bills for the raising of revenue to originate in the House of Representatives?

Note the language of the bill, and one example will serve for all. For the service rendered in handling drop letters the rate of postage at post offices where free delivery by carriers is not established shall be, according to the terms of the original bill, 1½ cents; according to the amendment, 1 cent.

Now, note the next clause—

SEC. 202. (a) Postal cards authorized in section 3916 of the Revised Statutes shall be transmitted through the mails at a postage charge, including the cost of manufacture, of 1½ cents each—

According to the original bill, but "1 cent each" according to the proposed amendment. Is the charge made on the individual who chooses to use this facility and to purchase and mail a postal card with a 1½-cent stamp or a 1-cent stamp on it revenue in the ordinary sense of the term, let alone the meaning of the expression as found in the Constitution? So it

is with reference to every single service provided for in this bill, the service as it is applicable to the zone system for which the bill provides and the extra charge for the service in transmitting the mail to the remote zones established by the bill or at present under the law. Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that there is a very good test, indeed, as to whether the charges provided for by the provisions of Title II of the bill are revenue in the sense meant by the Constitution.

One thing further, Mr. President. The authorities were cited and read from at length on yesterday. There are the three decisions of the Supreme Court—first, in the case of the United States against Norton, in which the question as to whether the money-order system established years ago was a system for raising revenue and whether a man having violated the law had violated a revenue law. The Supreme Court held in that case that it was not a revenue law, although every cent of the money received for a money order and every cent of fees paid for the issuance of the order went into the General Treasury of the United States.

Take the next case, that of Twin City Bank against Nebeker, where a 10-cent tax was imposed upon the circulation of national banks. The point was sought to be made that it was a revenue measure which should have originated in the House of Representatives. The court stated in that connection:

This language is applicable to the acts of Congress in the case at bar. Whatever taxes are imposed are but means to the purposes provided by the act.

I appreciate the point raised by the Senator from Ohio as to what the House of Representatives may do, but I wish to know if here and now in the consideration of this question the Senate is to be bound by what it thinks the House may possibly do in regard to this matter, or whether it is to be governed by the interpretations of the Constitution by the Supreme Court in case after case.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. May we not confidently assume that the House of Representatives will be governed by the authorities which have been cited and the strong and unanswerable reasons which have been given in support of the position of the Senator from South Dakota and other Senators?

Mr. STERLING. I think so. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for his observation.

Furthermore, Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota meant what he said in response to the Senator from California. Does the Senator from South Dakota think because the House, the other body, is likely to be governed by the considerations named that, therefore, in the Senate, abjectly and slavishly, we should bury our own opinions and not act as we think we ought to act?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, may I respond to the suggestion just made by the Senator from Ohio?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from California for that purpose?

Mr. STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. In response to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] I will say, of course not. I put the question in that form for this reason: At this moment I merely say that, in my opinion, this is not a revenue measure, for reasons which have been presented by various Senators, notably this morning by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] and immediately now by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], who has the floor. I inquired, may we not assume with perfect confidence that these authorities, this logic, the very philosophy of our Government, will appeal to the learned men in the House of Representatives? Wherefore, why should we hesitate, why should we timidly pause out of a childish fear that the House of Representatives will differ from us?

Mr. STERLING. That is as I understood the purport of the question of the Senator from California.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Multum in parvo.

Mr. STERLING. Yes. In that connection let me call the attention of Senators to this thought: The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] states that among the 435 Members of the House of Representatives there will be some one who will make the

point of order against this bill, should we pass it here. Does it conclusively follow because the point of order may be made that the point of order will be sustained?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. It might be overruled, Mr. President.

Mr. STERLING. It may be overruled. It may be submitted to the House of Representatives, as it is submitted to the Senate here, and the House of Representatives may vote against sustaining the point of order, if it shall be made.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Does the Senator believe that the House of Representatives will reverse its decision when its practice has been to follow the precedents that it has set?

Mr. STERLING. How recently has the House followed the precedent which was set away back 50 years ago?

Mr. FESS. I have never known the House of Representatives to reverse a precedent. Does the Senator from South Dakota remember the House of Representatives having reversed a precedent?

Mr. STERLING. No; I do not recall it having done so. I am not familiar with the proceedings in that respect in the other House, I will say to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is contrary to the rules to refer to what has taken place in the House of Representatives or to what takes place in the House of Representatives.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, the House of Representatives is not made up of Medes and Persians, but they are American statesmen—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That reference to the House of Representatives will be indulged.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And I am assuming that if they were wrong 40 years ago, they will strive to be right to-day.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I hope I have said nothing derogatory to the House of Representatives or to any Member of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has not done so.

Mr. STERLING. I think the Chair has been a little exacting in his construction of the rule. I hardly think the rule goes so far as the Presiding Officer now intimates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not mean to intimate that the learned Senator from South Dakota had said anything unparliamentary or in an offensive way.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. I wish to observe that if Senators desire to criticize the House of Representatives they ought to wait until the next Speaker of the House, Mr. LONGWORTH, shall have retired from this Chamber. [Laughter.]

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I was very much impressed with the argument of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER]. It seems to me it is conclusive. Money collected by the Government can not be called revenue except it arises from a tax, from a duty, from an impost, or from an excise; but there may even be bills providing for taxes which are not, according to the decisions of the Supreme Court, bills raising revenue, as in the case in Two hundred and second United States, where a tax of \$1,500,000 was imposed upon the people of the District of Columbia under the terms of two several bills, and yet they were held not to be within the meaning of the Constitution—bills for the purpose of raising revenue.

Mr. President, just one word further. I want Senators to consider the exigencies of the situation. We have before us a bill which we are pledged in a sense—and in a very large sense—to pass. It is a bill increasing the salaries of the postal employees. It is here now and has reached the state of consideration by the Senate. The question of time is very material and important, and I think we ought to go ahead as we are warranted in going ahead with this bill, taking the sense of the Senate upon the various amendments and upon the bill itself, and then testing out the question as to whether the House will raise and insist upon the point that it is a revenue bill and therefore should have originated in the House.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, under the Constitution the public lands are under the jurisdiction of Congress, are they not?

Mr. STERLING. They are.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And the Congress is made up of two Houses—the House of Representatives and the Senate. We all agree as to that. Now, could a bill not be introduced in the Senate providing for the leasing of the public domain or the sale of the public domain?

Mr. STERLING. I have no question about that, I will say to the Senator from California.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And as a consideration for the lease or for allowing the title to pass the Government would receive certain moneys, and those moneys would be converted into the Treasury.

Mr. STERLING. Certainly.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. It is all repetitious, but merely to emphasize the point, allow me to ask, is there any learned Senator, Member of this body, who would contend that a bill for the purpose of selling the public domain or of leasing it might not properly and constitutionally originate in the Senate?

I submit that that one illustration is determinative of the point raised by the Senator from Virginia. The mere circumstance that the Government receives some money does not make that money revenue in the constructive sense, nor does the fact that a bill provides for the getting of that money by a charge for service rendered or for property parted with make the bill one for the raising of revenue as contemplated by the Constitution.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the pending question except to read briefly from one decision. Of course, there are all kinds of courts and all kinds of decisions, but I have before me a decision which I think decides the point as to whether or not the pending bill is a revenue measure. It was argued here all day yesterday, and has been argued to-day, that a bill designed to raise \$63,000,000 and taking it out of the pockets of the people and putting it in the Treasury of the United States is not a revenue bill.

In the grand old State of Massachusetts, before its supreme court, one of the greatest courts in the country, this question came up for decision. There is a clause in the constitution of Massachusetts exactly like the clause in the Federal Constitution in regard to the body in which bills to raise revenue shall originate. The court in Massachusetts decided that money which is taken out of the pockets of the people and put into the treasury of the State is revenue. The decision, I think, is clearly in point. I read from One hundred and twenty-sixth Massachusetts Reports, on page 557, and the decision is signed by all of the judges. A question similar to that now before the Senate was sent to the judges for decision, namely, whether or not the senate of the Legislature of Massachusetts could originate appropriations, which was the same question that has arisen here time and time again, and which really has been settled by the Conkling report, from which I read yesterday. I will merely read from the syllabus of the Massachusetts case:

The exclusive privilege of the house of representatives, under the constitution of the Commonwealth, chapter 1, section 3, article 7, to originate money bills, is limited to bills that transfer money or property from the people to the State.

That is what is meant by revenue. Whenever a bill transfers money from the pockets of the people to the State treasury it is a revenue bill.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. Does the decision make any distinction between a tax imposed on all the people generally and a tax imposed upon those who use a special service of the Government and pay for that service?

Mr. OVERMAN. No; it does not make any such distinction, and certainly there can be no such distinction made in this case where it is proposed to take the \$63,000,000 from the people.

Mr. President, this question is 300 years old and more. Long years ago it was discussed in parliament, and there came near being a great war on account of it. When the power to raise money for governmental uses was transferred from the people that power was conferred on the House of Commons. So when the question was discussed in our Constitutional Convention, the members of that convention took the provision from the parliamentary rules of Great Britain as it is found in the Constitution to-day. Mr. Blackstone goes fully into that, and I presume all the lawyers of the Senate have read in Blackstone the passages where he goes on to show the

origin of the provision that all bills that raise money from the people for governmental purposes shall be initiated in the House of Commons of the English Parliament.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH in the chair). The Senator from Georgia suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ernst	McKellar	Shields
Ball	Ferris	McKinley	Shipstead
Bayard	Fess	McLean	Shortridge
Bingham	Fletcher	McNary	Simmons
Borah	Frazier	Mayfield	Smith
Brookhart	George	Means	Smoot
Broussard	Gerry	Metcalf	Spencer
Bruce	Gooding	Moses	Stanfield
Bursum	Hale	Neely	Sterling
Butler	Harris	Norris	Swanson
Cameron	Harrison	Oddie	Underwood
Capper	Heflin	Overman	Wadsworth
Caraway	Howell	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Johnson, Minn.	Pittman	Warren
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Ralston	Watson
Dale	Kendrick	Ransdell	Wheeler
Dial	King	Reed, Mo.	Willis
Dill	McCormick	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, on yesterday I participated in the discussion of some of the phases of the controversy in which we are now engaged, by my interruptions of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], in charge of the bill, and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], who is chairman of the committee reporting the bill. The question now before us is whether the pending measure provides for the raising of revenue and therefore, having originated in the Senate, contravenes the constitutional provision which invests the House of Representatives with the exclusive power of originating bills for such purpose.

It is gravely contended the Senate, ignoring the precedents and position of the other body of the Congress, should decide for itself that question. Senators have declared that our failure to do so would show a spirit of weakness, and an indisposition to defend the dignity and prerogatives of the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope that Senators, in making up their minds as to how they ought to vote upon this question, will not be influenced by the dilemma or the predicament in which the administration and the majority upon this floor might be put with respect to this legislation in case this point of order should be sustained. If the Senate wants to assert its prerogatives, and thinks it is in a position to assert and maintain its alleged prerogatives effectively, all well and good; but I hope Senators will not permit the fact of a legislative predicament to influence their minds in the determination of the question upon its merits.

Mr. President, the House of Representatives has the right, and the exclusive right, to settle this question. The Constitution lodges in the House the exclusive power to originate bills to raise revenue. That power necessarily carries with it the exclusive power to determine and decide whether a bill does raise revenue or not. We can not divest the House of Representatives of that constitutional right by any action we may take; and any action we may take in this respect, therefore, is futile, while any action that the House of Representatives may take is binding upon us.

To refuse to recognize the power of the House and the decisions of the House in this respect is to undertake to override the constitutional provision which gives them the exclusive right to originate bills to raise revenue; in other words, the exclusive right to originate bills to raise revenue implies, to be effective, the exclusive power to determine whether a bill does raise revenue or not.

Mr. President, we know what the attitude of the House is with respect to these revenue bills. During a long period of years the House has made its attitude clear. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS]—who was long a Member of the House, one of its leading Members, a student of parliamentary law, a student of constitutional law, and manifestly a man of reflection and observation—has called to the attention of the Senate the well-established and unbroken precedents of the House in this behalf. He called attention to the fact that the House in the assertion of this right has invariably returned to the Senate without action thereon bills held by it to provide for the raising of revenue.

The Senator from Ohio also assures this body that his long service and familiarity with the proceedings of the House, and the spirit of the House with respect to questions of this

sort leads him to believe that the House will not recede from the precedent so established. He goes further than that and says that he does not know any instance where the House has receded from its position upon this question.

Of course, Mr. President, we can enact this legislation, we can assert our alleged right if we wish to disregard the attitude and precedents of the House of Representatives; but if we put this provision in the bill, it is quite certain, I think, that the House will refuse to accept the bill. If it follows its precedents, it certainly will. That does not mean that we may not at this session have legislation upon this subject. The House can, if it sees fit to do so, initiate legislation providing revenue to cover increases in the salaries of postal employees. But the surest method of getting effective legislation in this matter is for the Senate to recognize the precedents of the House, to recognize the authority of the House to decide a question of this kind, and strike this section out of the bill, passing the balance of the bill providing for the increases in the salaries of the postal employees, let it go to the House, and then if it is found desirable, and the House shall so determine, the House can reincorporate that part of the bill which we eliminate, and there will be no delay in the process of legislation.

If there is a determination on the part of the majority party, or the administration, to resist the passage of this legislation in behalf of the postal employees unless the bill provides for additional revenue sufficient to take care of the increases, the House is as cognizant of that position as is the Senate. The House is in close touch with the leaders in this Chamber. If the House feels that the President would veto the bill again if it did not contain the provision for raising additional revenue by increase of postage rates, and that it is necessary to tack on, in order to secure the President's signature, such a provision, undoubtedly the House will add such a provision or make some other provision to meet the requirements of the situation created by the attitude of the President.

There is nothing involved in the decision of this question under discussion, therefore, which should defeat the main purpose of this bill, namely, to increase the salaries of postal employees; and if the rate section is eliminated from the bill and the bill goes to the House and it wants to pass the bill but is satisfied the President would veto it if it did not contain a revenue provision to take care of the increases, I assume the House would make some provision for the additional revenue to cover the salary increases, although I should oppose with all the vigor I have a bill coming from the House providing the same method of raising this money as is employed in this bill.

Mr. President, I can not see in the cases cited and the decisions relied upon by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] or by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] any justification for the confident position which they take that the courts have already settled this controversy. The courts have not settled this controversy. Not a single one of the decisions shows that the courts have settled it. All the courts have undertaken to decide is that in case a governmental service is created and the act creating it provides for payment for that service that that is not an act to raise revenue.

I do not controvert that position at all. I said yesterday in discussing this question that if this were an original bill for the purpose of creating a postal facility, such, for instance, as the Rural Free Delivery Service, it would be entirely competent for the Senate in providing for that service to provide for the funds to pay salaries of the employees of the Post Office Department charged with the performance of that service. In such a case it would be clear that the bill was for the purpose of providing funds to pay for a service to be performed and for no other purpose.

It was because I had that view that, upon the very threshold of the consideration of this question, when the very able and eloquent and resourceful Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] was discussing the amendments to the bill, I interrupted him and asked him what the policy of the committee was in imposing these increased postage rates, whether it was to make the rates more nearly commensurate with the service rendered, or because the present rates were thought by the committee to be too low. I asked him whether they increased the rates upon parcel post and newspaper advertising matter because they thought the present rates were now too low, or whether they were so increased for the purpose of raising an additional amount of revenue to be paid into the Treasury to meet a deficit expected to appear because of the proposed increases in postal salaries.

I had in mind this very distinction when I asked those questions, because I believed then, as I believe now, if the proposed increases in rates were based on the belief that they were at

present inadequate to the service rendered by the Government, the section of the bill making these increases would not be subject to the objection that it provided for raising revenue within the meaning of the constitutional provision which we have been discussing.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, is not that exactly what we are doing?

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, he will shortly see my point. The Senator probably was not here when I made my statement yesterday.

The Senator from New Hampshire admitted that the purpose of this section of the bill was to obtain revenue which should go into the Treasury for the purpose of meeting the salary increases made in the bill.

We have an admission to the effect that that is the purpose of the legislation. Not only does that admission come from the sponsor for this legislation upon the floor of the Senate, but that admission is implied in the very attitude of the President with regard to this legislation. Moreover, the bill itself in its title declares that it has a double purpose, one to raise the salaries and the other to raise the revenue to meet that increase in salary.

I think that the intent of Congress with respect to the legislation is the essential matter of the utmost importance in determining the question at issue. The court will gather its information as to that intent from the context of the act itself. If it finds from the context of the act that it is in effect one to raise revenue to defray Government expenses, then it will hold that it is subject to the constitutional provision with regard to the branch of the Congress authorized to originate such bills. If we know the intent that we ourselves have in the enactment of the legislation, whether we write that intent clearly in the bill or not, if we know our purpose and intent is to raise revenue to meet the increased expenses of the Government and not to adjust or increase charges for service rendered, then we ourselves ought to refrain from undertaking the exercise of power withheld from this body with respect to the origin of legislation.

In questions of this sort, in trying to ascertain what was the intent of Congress, the courts not only look to the context of the measure, but the courts examine the discussions in the Congress with a view of enlightening its judgment as to what was the real intent of the legislation. That it is our intent to do this thing—to raise revenue—is confessed on the floor of the Senate, confessed in the attitude of the President—yes, in the demand of the President, for the President is understood to demand that if we increase these salaries we shall at the same time provide additional revenue with which to pay the increase, and the bill is merely carrying out his demand.

I think the Supreme Court has sustained my contention in this respect. It was for the purpose of ascertaining what was the intent—not because I did not know it, but because I wanted it declared upon the floor of the Senate by the sponsor of the bill—that I interrogated the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] before this question was raised in order that I might have an authoritative declaration written in the records of the Congress as to what intent actuated and moved the committee in incorporating into the bill the provisions increasing postage rates.

Mr. McCORMICK. What was the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire with reference to the intent of the committee?

Mr. SIMMONS. It was made clear by the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire made on yesterday that the purpose of the committee in providing for these rate increases was to raise revenue to pay the increased salaries.

Mr. McCORMICK. Let me ask the Senator—

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me finish this and then I will yield to the Senator. The very case cited by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] bears out my contention. I shall not review the facts before the Supreme Court in the case of *United States v. Norton*, but it became necessary in deciding the case to determine whether a certain act was a revenue act within the meaning of the constitutional term to raise revenue. The court said:

There is nothing in the context of the act to warrant the belief that Congress in passing it was animated by any other motive than that avowed in the first section.

The motive there was to establish a postal monetary system. If that means anything it means that the court will look to the context for the purpose of seeing if there was any purpose in the act that might relate to revenue, and if there was purpose that might relate to revenue then they would

give weight to that purpose in their consideration of the case. The court said further:

The offenses charged were crimes arising under the money order act. The title of the act does not indicate that Congress, in enacting it, had any purpose of revenue in view. Its object, as expressly declared at the outset of the first section, was "to promote public convenience and to insure greater security in the transmission of money through the United States mails."

Mr. President, I think it is clear that in determining the question whether an act is designed to raise revenue the intent of Congress is of great importance, and it is upon that manifest intent in the pending bill that I put my objection to the rate section as infringing the rights of the House and therefore inadmissible in a bill originating in the Senate.

I do not think there can be any doubt about two things; first that it is the clear, manifest, undisputed purpose and intent of this particular part of the pending bill to impose the proposed increased postage for the purpose of raising revenue to defray the increased expenses of the Government caused by increasing the salaries of postal employees; second, it shall be enacted and the courts shall find that such was its purpose and intent; they will construe it to be an act to raise revenue. If the courts shall find that such was not the purpose, but that the purpose was to equalize and adjust postal rates, because at the present time they are unequal or unfair to the Government or to the patrons of the Government service, then the courts would, in my judgment, hold that those provisions were not for the purpose of raising revenue, but for the purpose of paying for the service.

But when it is coupled with another piece of legislation and is brought here admittedly for the purpose of raising revenue to meet the expenses of the Government involved in the other section of the bill, then it really becomes a revenue measure and the intent of the Congress in passing it is not to charge for service, but to raise money for a collateral purpose.

The House of Representatives can not be in any doubt about what the intent is with reference to the matter. The intent may not be sufficiently clearly written in the context of the bill to control the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court may not be able, using that context and the contemporaneous discussion of the question in the Congress, to gather our intent in that respect with sufficient certainty to enable them to apply it in the consideration of the question involved; but there is no trouble about the House knowing what the intent is.

The House knows as well as the Senate knows what purpose actuates and moves us in the imposition of these increased rates. The House knows that it is not for the purpose of fixing the scale of charges upon the basis of equity and fairness to the Government and to the users of this governmental facility. It knows that it is for the purpose of raising this money for some other reason than that which ought to actuate us in increasing postal rates.

Mr. President, we are impelled in our haste and our hurry to get revenue, under the demand of the President, to pay these increased salaries. We are hurried into imposing these taxes upon the users of the parcel post and increasing the rates on advertising matter in the newspapers and magazines of the country not because it has been determined by the committee, after thorough investigation, that it is the duty of the Government to do this, but because it is found expedient to do it, in order to meet the demands of the President to raise additional revenue to cover a probable deficit.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not significant that since the foundation of the Post Office Department there never before has originated in the Senate a bill to increase postal rates?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not recall any such bill having originated in the Senate since I have been here, now practically a quarter of a century.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate for any length of time in discussing the point of order which is now before the Senate.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me in order that I may make a point of order?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think the full Senate ought to hear what the Senator from Alabama shall say on this question, and I raise the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ferris	McCormick	Sheppard
Ball	Fess	McKellar	Shipstead
Bayard	Fletcher	McKinley	Shortridge
Bingham	Frazier	McLean	Simmons
Brookhart	George	McNary	Smith
Broussard	Gerry	Mayfield	Smoot
Bruce	Gooding	Metcalf	Spencer
Bursum	Hale	Moses	Stanfield
Butler	Harrell	Neely	Sterling
Cameron	Harris	Norbeck	Swanson
Capper	Harrison	Oddie	Underwood
Caraway	Heflin	Overman	Wadsworth
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Johnson, Minn.	Phipps	Warren
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Weller
Dale	Kendrick	Ralston	Willis
Dial	Keyes	Ransdell	
Dill	King	Reed, Mo.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I would not detain the Senate on this question of order if I did not regard it as one that is very far-reaching, and one that goes to the very fabric of the construction of government.

Some weeks ago I voted for the raise in the pay of the postal employees, because I believed that most of those men, if not all of them, are underpaid when you consider the advanced cost of living since their salaries were fixed heretofore; but I stand ready to vote against this bill in the form it is in if it comes to final passage. There are a number of reasons, but not the least of those is the method in which the bill comes before the Senate.

These employees are under the civil service. They are employees of the United States Government, not particularly of the Post Office Department. They receive their pay from the Treasury of the United States, not from the Post Office Department. It matters not whether the postal rates produce too much or too little; their pay is fixed by the Congress, and is supposed to be fixed in compensation for service rendered. If we are now to start a new precedent, one that is established for the first time in the history of this Government, and say that the basis of pay for service rendered shall be the question as to whether the Congress is willing to levy taxes on the American people in order to raise the revenue to compensate for that service, we have established an entirely new basis for service in the Post Office Department as distinguished from every other department of this Government.

I think that would be unfortunate for the Government; I think it would be most unfortunate for the employees; and I think it would be equally unfortunate for those who must pay the toll, because you are then going to bring about a competition between the political influence of the employee in an effort to raise his salary and the political influence of the man who is paying the toll in an effort to keep down his salary. I do not think the basis of compensation of any employee of this Government should be the question as to whether we can raise taxes to pay him. His compensation should be based on a fair and just return for service rendered.

Now as to the point of order. Mr. President, it seems to me very clear that the section of the bill that seeks to increase postal pay or the remuneration for carrying the mail is subject to the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

The reason of the law is the life of the law, and without the reason manifestly the law can never stand. The reason for the adoption of these clauses in the Federal Constitution is the life that stands behind them. You must bear in mind that it was the men who fought the War of the Revolution who wrote the Constitution of the United States, and one of the battle cries that they followed on the Revolutionary battle fields was that taxation without representation is unjust. Therefore when they wrote the Constitution of the United States they provided in the limitations of that instrument that all bills affecting revenue must originate in the House of Representatives; and why? Because that body more nearly represented the mass of the American people who pay taxes.

We may to-day pay a portion of our taxes measured by the standard of wealth, but we had no income tax in the days of the Revolution. We collected our taxes largely per capita; we collected them on the food the man ate, or the clothes he wore, or on some service rendered. Therefore we placed in the Constitution of the United States a limitation that provided that if you were going to tax him the taxing power must originate in the House, primarily representing the mass of the American people.

I have heard it said that that reason applied in that day because United States Senators were not directly elected by the people, but were elected by the legislatures, and that the House was elected directly by the people. I do not so understand the reason of the rule. The reason of the rule was that every State, regardless of its size and its population, was represented in this body by two Senators, while the number of Members of the House of Representatives depended on the population of the States. In other words, it came back to the principle that taxation without representation is unjust; and it is in the House and not here that the mass of the people of the United States are represented according to number. A smaller State has the same representation in this Assembly that the Empire State of New York has, and yet in the House of Representatives that smaller State has 1 vote and the Empire State of New York has 43. So it is perfectly clear that there was and is a reason for the rule maintained and established in the Constitution of the United States that bills affecting revenue must originate in the House.

If that is the reason of the rule, if it was placed in the Constitution to protect the mass of the American people against taxation, why should it not apply all along the line? Why should you discriminate? Why should you say that you may perchance levy an income tax and require that it shall originate in the House of Representatives, but at the same time that if you levy an impost tax on automobiles it may originate in the Senate? There is no reason for that rule. It does not apply. It does not come within the terms of the reason that moved the fathers who built the Constitution.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. KING. The Senator used the expression "bills affecting revenue," and stated that they must originate in the House. Does the Senator differentiate between the word "affecting" and the word "raising"? The Constitution says "raising," not "affecting."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not differentiate. It has been held that under the term "raising revenue" a bill decreasing revenue that originates in the Senate is equally unconstitutional.

Mr. KING. It is not unconstitutional.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I beg the Senator's pardon. I can not stop now to show him the authorities, but I will do so. It has been held that bills lowering revenue are just as unconstitutional, if they originate in the Senate, as bills raising revenue; because, forsooth, they fix the revenue tax, and in the end they are charging revenue.

As has been said in this debate, revenue means taxation, and that is true. That is the reason of the rule. It was to guard against unjust taxation that this clause was placed in the Federal Constitution; and the courts have said that raising revenue meant levying taxes. But what does levying taxes mean? What is a tax? A tax is a rate charged on person or property for the use of the Government?

Now, what is this? What is the proposal here? To increase postal rates; in other words, to require the user of the mails to put additional stamps on a package. The stamp merely represents the power of the Government. It is a permit for the use of the mails. The buying of the stamp is the charge, and it is a rate imposed either upon the person who sends the letter or on the letter itself, whichever you choose to call it, for the use of the Government of the United States. There can not be any question about that. The fact that the Post Office Department in a way renders a business service does not take it out of the rule. You might go to the Interior Department and go to the Public Lands Division and there apply the same rule. Of course, that would not be a tax, because the public lands already belong to the Government, and this rule applies only to taxation. But you can go to any of these departments where service is rendered, and the fact that there is a rendition of service does not change the fact that the revenue raised to support it is not taxation. It seems to me that is perfectly clear, and it has so been regarded since the beginning of this Government, and until this time I have never heard of a bill raising the rates in the Postal Service originating in the Senate of the United States.

Senators claim that we should stand firm to our rights and our prerogatives. Yes, Mr. President, if they are our rights and our prerogatives, but there is no greater disservice the Senate can give to the people of the United States than to seek to absorb to itself, where it may have a temporary lease of power, the control of matters which have not been given to us either by the Constitution or the people of the United States.

The Constitution gives to us the right to join with the President of the United States in making treaties. That is our

right, and we should be firm in maintaining that right. But the Constitution distinctly took away from us the right to originate certain classes of legislation, and it did so for a good reason. It did so in the interest of the great mass of the American people, and I say that for the Senate at this hour, under the pressure of a trying case, to seek to grasp power which we do not possess, to maintain rights which are not ours, would not only set a bad precedent, which would come back to haunt us, but it would mean a great disadvantage to the men we seek to serve.

In all honesty and candor I voted for the increases in the pay of the postal employees, because I believed they were entitled to them, but I know, and I think there are but few Senators here who do not know, that the House of Representatives is just as jealous of its rights and its prerogatives as is the Senate of the United States of its rights and prerogatives; that it will maintain them, and should maintain them.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. BAYARD. I do not know whether the Senator was present this morning when the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER] was talking on this subject, but he made the suggestion, as I understood him, that it was not the part of this body to be in any way afraid of whatever action the House might take; in other words, whatever conception the House might have of the duties and powers of the Senate was not a matter for this body to consider. It struck me at that time—and I want to make the suggestion to the Senator who is now speaking—that we are bound to take cognizance of our own powers in this body, and are we not to that extent a quasi judicial body, which must first determine its own jurisdiction of a matter pending before it before it can determine the consideration of the case?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the Senator is unquestionably right. If our position were clear, if it were within our power, I think we should maintain our position and our rights; but, to say the least, this proposal had hardly walked across the door of the Senate before its constitutionality was challenged. I served for 16 years on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and twice I participated in votes which sent back to the United States Senate bills which came over there containing provisions for raising revenue.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. To emphasize what the Senator has said, to show that this point of order made by me should be sustained, one of the ablest justices we ever had on the Supreme Court, Justice McLean, in a case reported in Twelfth Howard, delivered an opinion on this very question which seems to me should be conclusive of this matter. The question was as to whether postal revenues were taxes, so as to form the basis for a prosecution against a man who misused the revenues of the Government under a general statute. I want to read from the opinion, which seems to me ought to be conclusive of this question.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. What is the citation?

Mr. SWANSON. It is the case of United States v. Bromley, (12 How. 97). This is the language of the court:

Revenue is the income of a State, and the revenue of the Post Office Department, being raised by taxation on mailable matter conveyed in the mail and which is disbursed in the public service, is as much a part of the income of the Government as moneys collected for duties on imports.

The language under which that prosecution was had was "revenue of the Government," under the constitutional phrase.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the Senator is right. I do not think there is any doubt about that position.

Now, as to the practical proposition. If I really were not disposed to pass legislation which would give these men reasonable raises in their salaries, I would say—

On with the dance! Let joy be unconfined.

Let us ride on over the bluff and destroy the measure. But I know, and you know, Mr. President, that if we send this bill raising revenue in the Postal Service to the House of Representatives our action will be challenged at once. They will either refuse to pass the bill or they will send it back here.

We are within about 30 days of final adjournment. If we should pass this bill now with this provision in it, it would mean absolutely and unequivocally that the measure providing

for increases in the salaries of the postal employees would lie dead across the door of the Senate. There can be no question about that. On the other hand, if this point of order shall be sustained or on motion this section shall be stricken out of the bill, we will send the measure to the House of Representatives.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just allow me to finish this thought. If the House sees fit to put in the bill a provision for taxation to raise this money, they can do that; that is their prerogative. I think it would set a bad precedent. I think the question of the increases in the pay of these men should stand on service rendered and not depend on the condition of the Treasury. But the House could do that, and when the bill came back here, or went to conference, we would have a direct vote on the question involved, without any constitutional issue being raised.

Now, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we have already passed a postal salaries increase bill, which the President has vetoed. If the revenue features of this bill should be stricken out, that would leave the salary bill just as it was when the President vetoed it. Does the Senator think that the postal employees will get any increases of salary if all the revenue features are stricken out and the bill is left as it was before?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know what attitude the President may take in reference to the bill as it goes back to him. I am not prepared to say that. Nor am I prepared to say whether the House would pass it over his veto if it came back again. I think the vote when the bill came up before was very close. There might be a change.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to suggest it, if this section shall be eliminated—and I wish to say that if this point of order is not sustained I shall move to strike out the part of the bill imposing the tax—the bill can go to the House with these raises in it, and if the House sees proper to impose a tax, as it is given power under the Constitution to do, I do not see why the Senator from Tennessee should be so anxious that the Senate should impose these taxes. The House will have that privilege, if it thinks wise to put it through.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want to interfere with the remarks of the Senator from Alabama, but when he finishes I will be very glad to answer the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, of course the House can add a provision imposing these taxes, and we can consider that. I think it would be very unwise for the House to impose taxes in order to pay specific salaries. I think in the last analysis we would in that way put the Government employees on the battle line on one side against the taxpayers on the battle line on the other side, to the detriment and discomfort, in the end, of the Government employees. I do not think the question should be raised. I do not think it is a fair wage of battle. I think it is very much better in the end for these men to stand on what I believe are their just and fair rights; and if they do not obtain their rights to-day, they should come back tomorrow. But they should not let the issue as to whether or not they are entitled to the raises be dependent on whether the Government is willing to impose additional taxes out of which they shall be paid.

I think the point of order is clearly well taken, and I think from every point of view it ought to be sustained.

Mr. McCORMICK obtained the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The principal legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dill	King	Ralston
Bayard	Ernst	McCormick	Ransdell
Bingham	Fernald	McKellar	Reed, Mo.
Borah	Ferris	McKinley	Sheppard
Brookhart	Fess	McLean	Shields
Broussard	Frazier	McNary	Shipstead
Bruce	George	Mayfield	Shorridge
Bursum	Gerry	Means	Simmons
Butler	Gooding	Metcalf	Smith
Cameron	Hale	Moses	Spencer
Capper	Harris	Neely	Stanfield
Caraway	Harrison	Norbeck	Sterling
Copeland	Heflin	Oddie	Swanson
Couzens	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Underwood
Cummins	Johnson, Minn.	Owen	Wadsworth
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Kendrick	Phipps	Watson
Dial	Keyes	Pittman	Willis

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] is necessarily absent on business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] yesterday, so it seemed to me, made more clearly manifest than has any other Senator the issue before us. I recognize that in a parliamentary body it is perhaps sometimes necessary to invoke the good offices of parliamentary experts whose capacity to refine distinctions passes the comprehension of ordinary men. Some of those who have joined in this debate remind me of the theologians of Alexandria and Byzantium. After all, whatever the decisions of the courts or of the Chair may have been on the pending point of order, the rule of reason must govern.

It is asserted that this is a revenue bill—a revenue bill when the Post Office is engaged in active competition with private enterprise, when the Post Office conducts a savings bank, when the Post Office forwards money orders, when the Post Office makes a special charge to deliver some letters more promptly than others, and when the Post Office is engaged in the express business in competition with the private express monopoly formed by permission of Secretary McAdoo. The conditions in the Post Office to-day are not identical or even analogous to those which obtained at the time of the decision by the Supreme Court in 1851 of the case cited by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I may suggest that after that time the Dred Scott decision regarding the fugitive slave law was handed down and the American people passed adverse judgment upon it.

If we are to act upon a measure which has to do with Government competition with private service, with its employment of individuals who thereby become competitors of the employees of private enterprises, we are not acting upon a revenue measure. We are dealing with the Post Office as an agency in the service of the people. It was intended to raise the pay of postal employees precisely as the pay of employees in other like lines of business have been raised.

The President has declared that he will not consent that the pay of those postal employees be raised unless the service in which they are engaged is placed upon a self-sustaining or nearly self-sustaining basis.

A point of order has been raised against Title II of the measure, a point of order raised in order to strike from the bill Title II regarding charges for service even at the risk that the pay of the postal employees may not be raised. I think there is a general belief on the floor of the Senate that some of those who are interested in sustaining the point of order are more concerned with the political advantage to be gained than they are either with the prerogatives of the other Chamber or with the advance of salaries of postal employees. Those who have—as I have not—discussed at length the point of order in the light of the decisions of the courts and the Presiding Officers of the Houses of Congress have none the less indulged in speeches about the character of the bill and about the postal employees. If the point of order is sustained, those who sustain it know full well that there is every probability that there will be no increase in the pay of postal employees, and that, although the responsibility will be theirs, they will seek to place it upon Senators on this side of the Chamber or upon the President of the United States.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Is not that where the responsibility belongs?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from New York is always confident, if not always accurate, in assertions. Did the Senator rise to ask me a question?

Mr. COPELAND. I was hoping that the Senator would answer the question I propounded.

Mr. McCORMICK. I thought the Senator had made a statement.

Mr. COPELAND. No; I asked the Senator if the responsibility for the defeat of the postal salary increase bill should not rest with the Republican Party and the Senator's colleagues on the other side of the aisle?

Mr. McCORMICK. I will answer that if the pending measure in the general terms reported by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] is defeated the responsibility indubitably will be on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. COPELAND. I assume from the answer of the Senator that he admits that up to this time the responsibility for the defeat of the postal salary increase lies at the door of the Republican Party.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator is entitled to assume what he may, whether with regard to the pending bill or the title to the Isle of Pines.

Mr. COPELAND. I hope the Senator is not so wrong on the pending bill as he is on the Isle of Pines. However, I would be glad if he would let us know what attitude the Republican Party is taking regarding the increase of salaries for the postal employees who have worked so valiantly for the bill, and who are so thoroughly entitled to its enactment into law.

Mr. McCORMICK. I have noticed that recently the Senator from New York has become the spokesman for the party in his State. Will he speak for the party here in the Senate?

Mr. COPELAND. Of course, I may say in reply to that—

Mr. McCORMICK. Since Governor Smith has been de-throned?

Mr. COPELAND. I doubt exceedingly if the Senator from Illinois can quite speak for the Republican Party of his State.

Mr. McCORMICK. I have not pretended to speak for the Republican Party.

Mr. COPELAND. That is the reason, I suppose, why the Senator is not willing to answer the question I asked a little while ago, whether or not his party is responsible for the defeat of the postal salary bill.

Mr. McCORMICK. That is not the reason. There is a division on this side of the Chamber upon the point of order precisely as there is a division on the other side of the Chamber, as the Senator very well knows.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Referring to the two cases which were brought to the attention of the Senator from Illinois while he was speaking by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], I desire to say that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] called my attention to the following reference to both of them which is made by the Supreme Court of the United States in United States against Norton, in Ninety-first United States, at page 569. The reference is this:

The cases of United States v. Bromley (12 How. 88) and United States v. Fowler (4 Blatch. 311) are relied upon by the counsel for the United States.

Those are the two cases to which I refer and which were mentioned by the Senator from Virginia—

Both these cases are clearly distinguishable with respect to the grounds upon which the judgment of the court proceeded from the case before us. It is unnecessary to remark further in regard to them.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Virginia is conveniently absent from the Chamber.

Mr. President, let me repeat that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] made plain the issue before the Senate. This bill does not involve the levying of taxes upon the whole people—that is, the collecting of revenue—but it deals with the imposition of charges upon certain people for services rendered to those people by the Government like or identical to services rendered by private enterprise. If the Government is to engage in such service, then the Legislature of the Government must be able to legislate in order that the Government may compete upon reasonably equitable conditions with private enterprise.

If there had been no disposition to raise a political issue here in the Senate, the discussion of the point of order by those who have supported the contention of the Senator from Virginia would have confined themselves to the point of order, but even my friend, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], after alluding to precedents and prerogatives and constitutional powers, embarked upon a discussion of the measure and found fault with its terms, debating it not as if it were out of order but as if its provisions were the major issue and contending that it was faulty in construction.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President—

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BAYARD. I would suggest the following quotation from the veto message of the President of last June, which is found on page 3:

For the fiscal year 1923 the postal revenues were \$32,000,000 less than the cost of the service for that year.

So the President of the United States used the word "revenues" with regard to the result of the raising of the postal rates. I do not see how the Senator can get away from the fact that this is a revenue bill.

Mr. McCORMICK. But, Mr. President, one may say that the income of a railroad is its revenue, may he not? I think that is hairsplitting in which the Senator from Delaware will hardly care to indulge.

Mr. BAYARD. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I merely made that quotation from the President's message because of the fact that the Senator himself was referring to various enterprises in the country which, from his point of view, came in contact with the operations of the Government; and he is using that to base his argument on in order to show that these were not revenue measures but were mere fiscal measures of the Government, separate and apart from any revenue measures. I was quoting from the President, who vetoed this measure and who used the very word "revenues" in connection with the return from postal operations.

Mr. McCORMICK. I still insist that the use by the President of the term "revenues" in that connection does not imply that the charges under this bill constitute revenue under the terms of the Constitution any more than the incomes of railroads accruing from freight and passenger fares are revenues because they are sometimes so described.

THE FRENCH DEBT

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, yesterday when I was engaged in a colloquy with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] he abruptly shut off the prosecution of my interruption by saying that he did not want me to introduce any incorrect history into his speech. How far this curt disposal of my interruption was consistent with the ordinary amenities of parliamentary intercourse I will leave the Senator to determine for himself in his more meditative moments; but if by that statement the Senator intended to ascribe to himself any extraordinary degree of accuracy as a historian, I beg leave to say that about the only correct history in his speech was that which I contrived to inject into it. [Laughter.]

When I made the statement that France not only loaned large sums to the people of the United Colonies during the War of the Revolution but made large gifts to them also, and when I recalled a gift of no less than 6,000,000 livres made by France to the people of the United States during that Revolution the Senator said:

That took place, as the Senator must know, because at the time Franklin applied for that loan the French Government was not willing to risk its chances with the American Colonies, and they never did take the risk until after the Battle of Saratoga. Therefore they transmitted this loan—this gift, if the Senator prefers to call it such, which afterwards transformed itself into a loan—through certain individuals from whom Franklin got it.

The surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga took place on October 17, 1777. The gift of 6,000,000 livres was not made until the year 1781, and that fact is evidenced by the exhibit itself, which the Senator from Idaho has had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with his speech.

It had no connection whatsoever with the subsidies that America received from France and Spain through the agency of Beaumarchais. As evidenced by the Senator's exhibit, those subsidies amounted to some 3,000,000 livres. Two millions of that amount was advanced in 1776 to Beaumarchais by the French Government for the purpose of assisting the American colonists, and another million was advanced in the same year to him by Spain for the same purpose. Franklin had no connection whatever with those subsidies. He did not even arrive in France until the latter part of the year 1776. Silas Deane, not Franklin, was our minister at the Court of France during that year, and, even after Deane, Franklin, and Arthur Lee were appointed our ministers to Paris, all transactions that our country had with Beaumarchais, or the commercial house of Roderique Hortalez & Co., which was the screen for these transactions, were conducted by Beaumarchais with Silas Deane alone. Deane alone was privy on behalf of America to the Beaumarchais operations.

I shall not pause to read in detail the statements in the Life of Franklin, by James Parton, which sustain these allegations. He is perhaps the most authoritative biographer of Benjamin Franklin; and upon his testimony, as well as upon other testimony that I could readily cite, I base my assertion that, after what he said about my inaccuracy, the Senator from Idaho has fallen into complete, irredeemable error when he connects the gift of 6,000,000 livres of which I have spoken with Beaumarchais. The six millions, as I have said, were

given by France to the United States in the year 1781, and this, too, is shown by the Senator's exhibit; and I desire to pause just for a moment to bring to the attention of the Senate the circumstances under which that splendid gift was made.

I refer to Parton's Life of Benjamin Franklin, volume 2, page 391. Parton states that Franklin was instructed to ask for a loan of 25,000,000 of francs from France. He made the application, and then Parton goes on and describes the result:

He had to wait three anxious weeks for an answer, during which arrived Col. John Laurens, the minister sent expressly by Congress to promote the loan. The arrival of Colonel Laurens gave Doctor Franklin an excuse for pressing his request anew upon the Count de Vergennes, who sent for him at length. "He assured me," Franklin wrote, "of the King's good will to the United States; remarking, however, that being on the spot, I must be sensible of the great expense France was actually engaged in and the difficulty of providing for it, which rendered the lending us twenty-five millions at present impracticable. But that to give the States a signal proof of his friendship, His Majesty had resolved to grant them the sum of six millions not as a loan but as a free gift. This sum, the minister informed me, was exclusive of the three millions which he had before obtained for me to pay the Congress drafts for interest expected in the current year."

Parton continues:

It was a timely and precious gift. It enabled Doctor Franklin to sustain the credit of America in Europe, and it contributed essentially to the success of the campaign which ended in the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown.

And I may add that when Franklin was instructed to apply to France for the loan of 25,000,000 of francs George Washington wrote to him—this was just before the Revolutionary campaign of 1781—

We must have one of two things, peace or money from France.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senator is reading from James Parton?

Mr. BRUCE. I am reading from James Parton. I gave the volume and the page.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator will recall an incident in the life of James Parton which illustrates his historical worth. White-law Reid at one time introduced James Parton to a literary club in New York as the great American novelist.

Mr. BRUCE. Did he? Well, I think this is a case where truth is stranger than fiction, perhaps.

Mr. BORAH. "Perhaps" is good.

Mr. BRUCE. This is one case, at any rate, in which fiction rests upon a solid basis of historic truth.

But I need not turn—and nobody knows it better than the Senator from Idaho—to Parton in confirmation of what I have been saying, because, as I have said, the fact of this gift of 6,000,000 of livres, though the Senator from Idaho seemed to be unconscious of that fact, was evidenced by the very exhibit that he inserted in the RECORD in association with his speech. Such was the spirit in which George Washington regarded the significance of that gift; such was the spirit in which Benjamin Franklin regarded its significance; and that it was precious at that particular crisis in the history of our country does not rest upon the mere asseveration of James Parton or any other historian, but upon unquestionable contemporary testimony.

Let us inquire just a little more in detail what impression the gift made upon the mind of Franklin at that time. It was made, of course, when our country was weak and enveloped with doubt and uncertainty, not to say despair. When the Senator from Idaho spoke yesterday he was speaking in the plenitude of our amazing power, when the relative positions of France and of the United States of America at the time of the Revolution had been completely reversed; and when it was no longer the United States that was approaching France and asking for favors, but France approaching the United States and asking for them. As there is no other authority readily at hand, I take the liberty of quoting from a work of Benjamin Franklin, Self-Revealed, in which I personally have had something to say on this subject:

He [Franklin] was generously prompt always also to ascribe any temporary interruption to the flow of French subsidy to the pressing necessities of France herself. Full, too, always he was of simple-hearted gratitude to France for the princely help that she had given to the American cause. No one knew better than he that this help originated partly in selfish policy, and was continued partly because it had been extended too liberally already to be easily discontinued. "Those, who have begun to assist us," he shrewdly observed to Jay, when counseling him that every first favor obtained from Spain was tant de gagné, "are more likely to continue than

to decline." Every appeal that he ever made in his life to liberality in any form took the bias of self-interest duly into account. But he was merely true to his settled principle that human character is an amalgam of both unselfish and selfish motives, when, realizing that the aid rendered by France to the United States originated partly in the glow of a generous enthusiasm for the cause of human liberty and fraternity, he wrote to Robert R. Livingston on August 12, 1782, in a letter in which, after stating that the whole amount of the indebtedness, then due by the United States to France, amounted to 18,000,000 livres, exclusive of the Holland loan guaranteed by the King of France, he said—

And it is to these words especially that I invoke the attention of the Senate—

In reading it—

Franklin was referring to a statement of an account between the United States and France which had been presented to him recently by the French minister—

In reading it [a statement of the account] you will discover several fresh marks of the King's goodness toward us, amounting to the value of near two millions. These, added to the free gifts before made to us at different times, form an object of at least twelve millions, for which no returns but that of gratitude and friendship are expected. These, I hope, may be everlasting.

In a subsequent letter to Vergennes, Franklin referred to the King as our "friend and father." But naturally enough deep-seated gratitude found its most impressive utterance when the long and bloody war was at an end, the independence of the United States fully established, and Franklin ready, as he wrote to Robert R. Livingston, to say with old Simeon, "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation."

There are further words of gratitude uttered by him:

May I beg the favor of you, sir, [he wrote to Vergennes, when he was soon to leave France forever], to express respectfully for me to His Majesty, the deep sense I have of all the inestimable benefits his goodness has conferred on my country; a sentiment that it will be the business of the little remainder of life now left me, to impress equally on the minds of all my countrymen. My sincere prayers are, that God may shower down His blessings on the King, the Queen, their children, and all the royal family to the latest generations.

How any man can read those kindling words and then dwell in any strain of ignoble criticism upon the country which called them forth, is more than I, at any rate, can understand.

So much for the inaccuracy of the Senator from Idaho with regard to the origin of this gift of 6,000,000 livres. Now, until some more substantial testimony to the contrary has been brought to my attention than has yet been brought to it, I think that he was equally inaccurate when he stated that this gift was paid back. I find no evidence of the fact in the exhibit that he has had recorded with his speech. Nor have I ever seen such a fact stated by any biographer of Franklin or any authoritative book of any kind relating to Franklin.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BRUCE. I do, even at the risk of having some incorrect history inserted in my speech.

Mr. BORAH. No; I am not going to insert any history at all.

Mr. BRUCE. No; the Senator had better try fiction.

Mr. BORAH. I was going to say that if the Senator has any evidence himself that it was not paid, I will accept it.

Mr. BRUCE. Evidence! When a thing is a gift, it is a gift; and when the fact is established that a gift has been made, the presumption, of course, is that it has never been treated as a loan and paid back.

Mr. BORAH. I understand that is the Senator's only answer?

Mr. BRUCE. It is my answer, and it is an unanswerable answer, I think.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I think it is, in the way it is put.

Mr. BRUCE. An unanswerable answer, I believe.

Mr. BORAH. I quite agree with the Senator, if the Senator's conclusion is that there is no answer to it.

Mr. BRUCE. That exhibit shows that all the loans made by France were either paid back by 1795 or reduced to the form of 4½ per cent and 5 per cent stock, some of which was paid off at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and some as late as the year 1815; but nowhere in that exhibit, nowhere in any biography of Franklin, nowhere in any authoritative publication of any kind, I venture to say, though I speak subject to correction, can be found the slightest scintilla of evi-

dence going to show that one single dollar that the United States of America received in the gift of 6,000,000 livres from France was ever paid back to France.

Mind you, as that exhibit shows, too, this gift of 6,000,000 livres was not the only gift received by the people of the United Colonies from France during the War of the Revolution. There was another gift through Franklin of 2,000,000 livres, in 1777, making the whole amount of the gifts given by France to the people of the United Colonies, including the subsidy of 2,000,000 livres received by Beaumarchais from France in Spain in 1776, 10,000,000 livres—a sum equivalent, in terms of American money, to \$1,815,000, and a sum, though I do not pretend to speak at this moment with any exactitude upon such a point, as that, probably four or five times greater in point of purchasing power than the same sum of money would be to-day.

So, if I were disposed to indulge in a spirit of rash assertion, such as I conceive the Senator from Idaho to have indulged in to some extent when he brushed me so quickly aside, I should say that his speech in regard to these historical incidents was highly inaccurate.

I admire the rare abilities of the Senator from Idaho; I admire his persuasive eloquence; I admire his integrity of character; I admire his independent, fearless spirit. When I came to this body, a stranger and unknown, he was one of the first of its older Members who held out to me the hand of cordial fellowship, and I am sure that if he had had just a little more time to give to this matter what he said would have been marked by his usual accuracy. But, highly as I think of the Senator in every other respect, if I were to judge of him as a historian by what he said yesterday I should say that he was one of the most untrustworthy historians that ever came to my knowledge in the range of my humble historical labors.

When the Senator speaks of France being governed entirely by selfish motives in coming to the aid of the colonists, he fails to draw the distinction, as I apprehend it, between the French Government and the French people. Of course, Louis XVI was a king. His trade was that of a king—a crowned head. Naturally enough, the spectacle of a people rising up in insurrection on the other side of the ocean and defying the armed power of their sovereign was one that he, at least, did not relish. Nor of course did his minister, Turgot, who shared his responsibilities, relish it, and there is no question in the world that the participation of France in the American Revolution was to no small extent inspired by the hostility of France to England, by the wish to wound her, to injure her, to maim her, to separate her from her valuable colonies. That those considerations entered into the executive policy of France at the beginning of the American Revolution no one can gainsay, but equally hard it would be to gainsay the fact that king and minister and government were all hurried into the alliance between France and the people of America by the passionate sympathy which the people of France came to feel for the cause of American liberty.

Why, in order to establish his views should the Senator from Idaho have turned to the history of the United States by Woodrow Wilson, whose history, I say with great respect, is regarded with very little favor by any true historical student, remarkable as the intellectual powers and public services of Woodrow Wilson were in many respects.

And why should the Senator from Idaho refer to Alexander Hamilton, above all men of the world, in support of his claim that France was animated solely by selfish motives in taking a part in the American cause? Hamilton was a native-born Englishman. All his prepossessions were in favor of the English monarchical form of government. He shared all the old, immemorial hatred of his people for the French. He felt like the character in Shakespeare who said:

I thought upon one pair of English legs
Did march three Frenchmen.

Of course, he approached such a subject with an absolutely inveterate, irrepressible bias against France. And if the utterance of his referred to by the Senator was made after the deadly feud that sprang up between him and Thomas Jefferson, who, of course, was a devoted friend of the French people, there was all the more reason, in view of the rivalry that existed between him and Jefferson, why he should have no tolerance of comment whatever for France and be unwilling to acknowledge that she had been actuated by generous motives in assisting the American Colonies.

Let us turn rather to what, after all, is the only true testimony with regard to any historical controversy; that is, to the best contemporary testimony. First of all, let us refer to

Count Sigur, one of the ornaments of the French court, as to the general state of the French mind in relation to America and its cause at the beginning of the American Revolution.

Says Count Sigur:

It would be difficult to describe the eagerness and delight with which the American envoys—the agents of a people in a state of insurrection against their monarch—were received in France, in the bosom of an ancient monarchy. Nothing could be more striking than the contrast between the luxury of our capital, the elegance of our fashions, the magnificence of Versailles, the still brilliant remains of the monarchical pride of Louis XIV, and the polished and superb dignity of our nobility, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the almost rustic apparel, the plain but firm demeanor, the free and direct language of the envoys, whose antique simplicity of dress and appearance seemed to have introduced within our walls, in the midst of the effeminate and servile refinement of the eighteenth century, some sages contemporary with Plato, or republicans of the age of Cato and of Fabius. This unexpected apparition produced upon us a greater effect in consequence of its novelty and of its occurring precisely at the period when literature and philosophy had circulated amongst us an unusual desire for reforms, a disposition to encourage innovations and the seeds of an ardent attachment to liberty.

All this is strikingly corroborated by Thomas Jefferson, who, as we all know, became our minister to France after Franklin had left that country. Speaking of the French Revolution, Jefferson said:

Celebrated writers of France and England had already sketched good principles on the subject of government; yet the American Revolution seems first to have awakened the thinking part of the French nation in general from the sleep of despotism in which they were sunk. The officers, too, who had been to America were mostly young men less shackled by habits and prejudice and more ready to assent to the suggestions of common sense and feeling of common rights than others. They came back with new ideas and impressions. The press, notwithstanding its shackles, began to disseminate them; conversation assumed new freedoms. Politics became the theme of all societies, male and female, and a very extensive and zealous party was formed which acquired the appellation of the Patriotic Party who, sensible of the abusive government under which they lived, sighed for occasions of reforming it. This party comprehended all the honesty of the kingdom sufficiently at leisure to think—the men of letters, the easy bourgeois, the young nobility—partly from reflection, partly from mode; for these sentiments became matter of mode, and as such united most of the young women to the party.

In other words, so universal was the popular sympathy of the French with American ideas of liberty, that the American cause became even the mode with the young women of France.

I ask whether, in the face of such contemporary testimony as that, it is possible for anyone reasonably to declare that in espousing the cause of American independence France was influenced solely by selfish motives. When our rebellion began she was feeling the premonitions of her own subsequent revolution. Her people were laboring under a frightful load of feudal tyranny. They were bowed down to the very earth by all sorts of oppressive taxation, and by the special privileges of caste in many forms. They were already more or less ripe for revolt, though they scarcely realized in their own hearts the extent to which they were.

As I said yesterday, the ideas and the sentiments of the American Revolution were stirring in their veins as the vernal sap stirs in the limb of a tree in the springtime. That is the real reason why Franklin, when he lived in France, was acclaimed as he was. That is the real reason why hundreds of medallions of his face were struck off and distributed far and wide among the people of France, and why portrait after portrait was painted of him and bust after bust fashioned of him, and why he was revered and idolized and adored as he was. Of course, his greatness was such that he needed no artificial aids of any kind to be a conspicuous figure in Paris or any other capital in the world. But he never would have been the renowned figure that he was, the world figure that he was, if the French people had not seen in him a glorious exemplar of the new spirit of freedom that was bringing the United States of America into the great family of free and independent nations.

As for Lafayette, he was but one of the many young Frenchmen who left France to unsheathe their swords in the cause of America. So many French officers were eager to cross the ocean and engage in our war of independence that the matter finally became a source of vexation and to some extent of merriment to Benjamin Franklin. It was only because of the peculiar nobility of his character, because of his high social position, because of the special circumstances under which he

left France that Lafayette rather than many another young Frenchman became the fresh, captivating, immortal figure that he is.

Let the Senator from Idaho take my advice in one respect, if he should never take it in another, and sit down and see with what little popular success he could rewrite the school history of the people of the United States in consonance with his peculiar ideas about the events that led to the alliance between France and the American Revolution. He seems to think that because we gave Lafayette a sum of money and a considerable tract of land our debt of everlasting gratitude to him was discharged. I do not so construe the meaning of gratitude. If the Senator from Idaho were, at considerable sacrifice to himself, to loan me the sum of \$1,000 and I afterwards paid it back to him, I would not think that my debt to the Senator was completely discharged. It would be discharged, of course, in its pecuniary aspects, but in its moral aspects never. When Lafayette received that sum of money and that tract of land from the people on those shores of which he spoke in one of his letters to Jefferson as "the blessed shores of liberty," the debt that we as a people owed him was not extinguished. From that day to this we have loved to honor him in all the ways in which the profoundest respect and affection of a people manifest their sense of imperishable gratitude.

I agree substantially with the Senator from Idaho in what he said yesterday with regard to the general features of the French debt. The most searching questions that can be asked of the individual are how honorably does he meet his debts and other moral obligations in time of peace; how ready is he to lay down his life in time of war?

Those questions involve the supreme tests of individual character. They involve also the supreme tests of national character. Of course, France must pay her debt to us. She should be scrupulous enough to avoid even any appearance of evasion or shabby indifference with regard to paying it. I will not permit myself to doubt that when the time comes she will make a faithful, earnest effort to do all that she can toward its payment; but, in the meantime, I do say that when the representatives of this great country, the wealthiest and the most powerful upon the globe, shall take up for settlement the matter of the French debt, they should at least not forget those extraordinary gifts that she made to us in the hour of our peril, anxiety, and distress.

The finest thing in the life of this Nation is not its splendid material achievements, not its extensive acquisitions of territory, not even the determined spirit with which it has always defended its national rights, but the spirit in which in recent years it has dealt with foreign and weaker peoples when they had some real moral claim upon our consideration. If I were to single out the most admirable thing, perhaps, in our entire history, the event that sheds upon us as a people the highest degree of credit, I should single out the return of the Boxer indemnity to China. I might speak also of the generous spirit that we have imported into our relations to our territorial dependencies, the mingled sagacity and magnanimity that inspired us to go down to Cuba and to confer upon her people the priceless boon of freedom, and yet afterwards to retire as we did in honor from her shores. Here is still another opportunity, within sensible, practical limits, to exhibit again a certain amount of nobility of feeling and purpose.

The amount that France gave us is, after all, in terms of modern wealth, but small; it is not so much in a pecuniary sense; but if we were to deduct the total sum of those gifts from what France owes to us, I think that the moral value of the concession would be almost inestimable. We should then have made, at least, some sort of return for the valuable services that France rendered to us during the War of the Revolution, because, even though the Senator from Idaho and I should differ with regard to every other historical question that enters into this discussion, I think we would both agree that but for the aid of France in men and arms and munitions of war we should never have achieved our independence as a people.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BRUCE. I was about to take my seat. However, I yield to the Senator with pleasure.

Mr. BORAH. Then I will not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. That is all right.

Mr. BORAH. I was merely going to say that I could not agree with the conclusion just stated by the Senator from Maryland. Notwithstanding the fact that I think that there

was substantial aid rendered us by France, for which we are very grateful, I could not concede that we could not have won our independence without the aid of France, for the tide had distinctly turned in our favor and Lord North had announced his conciliatory plan before France entered the war at all upon our behalf.

Mr. BRUCE. But he would not have announced it but for the fear of a French alliance. I agree with the Senator from Idaho in believing that in process of time, unless the whole attitude of the British Government toward us had undergone an alteration, we should have acquired our national freedom, because the increase in American wealth and population was such that in a few generations it would have been absolutely impossible for any other nation on earth, however powerful, to have kept us in chains.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, a few days ago I made some observations regarding the history of the loans of France to this Government and our payment of them, but I did not think they would form a preface to what has developed into a most interesting discussion between the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BRUCE]. I think, therefore, I might be permitted to take a few moments to make a sort of addendum to the discussion.

In his desire yesterday to enforce his argument in support of his contention that France should not disregard her debt to this country the Senator from Idaho omitted, to say the least, some historical facts that are worth remembering in connection with the settlement of our Revolutionary debt to France. While it is true that we made an agreement with France in 1782 to pay what we owed, I think the authorities are agreed—and I find nothing in the Senator's statement in the RECORD to disprove it—that the French King did forgive the interest that had accrued on the loans up to that date. Furthermore, while that agreement provided that we should begin payment within three years after the conclusion of peace, the authorities agree that we did not begin to pay on our debt until after the Constitution was adopted and the new Government was set in motion, for the simple reason that under the Articles of Confederation we could not raise the money.

It is worth remembering also that it was through the credit of France, if not her own treasury, that after the Revolution was over the United Colonists were able to borrow enough money in Europe to finance their representatives abroad and even to establish the new Government and put it into operation.

I refer to this as an explanation of my statement that the Senator from Idaho omitted some things when he said that we paid promptly all our debt to France. It is true that as soon as the new Government was able to raise the money it did so, and settled all of our debt with France on time, as provided by the agreement of 1782.

I do not mention these facts in any way to give ground to anyone to believe that France should be allowed to disregard her debt to us, but I do mention them in the interest of fairness to the history of the early association of the colonists with the French Government at that time.

For my own part, I can see nothing to be gained at this time by our belittling in any way the assistance that France gave to the colonists in the days of trial in their trouble with England. I agree with the Senator from Maryland that without the aid of France the Revolution would have failed; or if not, it would have been prolonged for many years. Her service and her help to us were almost as valuable as our service and our help to her during the late war.

Neither, Mr. President, can I see anything to be gained on the part of France by belittling the assistance that we rendered in the World War to her, for, as suggested yesterday, we did help to save her life. We paid the debts which we incurred during the Revolution in order to save the Revolutionary cause and to enable the united colonists to form a republic, and we accepted certain gifts and offsets of interest on the part of the French Government. So, I think that to-day France ought to pay the debt she owes us, but that we should meet her in the same liberal, generous spirit that her representatives met our forefathers in the days of long ago.

I, for one, am not insistent that the terms shall be absolutely the same as those we have made with England. The condition of France may demand and justify better terms. Her condition should be taken into consideration, and we should remember, recalling the spirit of amity that has so long existed between these countries, that we can afford to be generous. Let me add that I agree absolutely that France has waited all too long and that she ought to make a proposition for settlement of the debt and make it now in order that the talk of repudiation may be stopped for all time.

POSTAL SALARIES AND POSTAL RATES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Ferris	McKellar	Shipstead
Ball	Fess	McKinley	Shortridge
Bayard	Fletcher	McLean	Simmons
Bingham	Frazier	McNary	Smith
Borah	George	Mayfield	Smoot
Brookhart	Gerry	Means	Spencer
Broussard	Gooding	Metcalf	Stanfield
Bruce	Hale	Moses	Sterling
Bursum	Harrell	Neely	Swanson
Butler	Harris	Norbeck	Underwood
Cameron	Harrison	Oddie	Wadsworth
Capper	Heflin	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Howell	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Warren
Couzens	Johnson, Minn.	Philips	Watson
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Weller
Dale	Kendrick	Ralston	Wheeler
Dial	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Willis
Dill	King	Sheppard	
Ernst	McCormick	Shields	

Mr. FESS. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is indisposed and unavoidably absent from the Chamber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll upon the pending question.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Chair again state the question for the information of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate sustain the point of order raised by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]? The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAYARD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. FESS (when Mr. CURTIS's name was called). The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. Were the Senator from Kansas present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. ERNST (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MCLEAN (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. OWEN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] to the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DALE. My colleague [Mr. GREENE] is unavoidably detained. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. STEPHENS] is unavoidably absent. He has a pair on this question with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE]. If my colleague were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "yea."

I desire also to announce that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is unavoidably absent. He has a pair on this question with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS]. If the senior Senator from Arkansas were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] has a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES].

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—29

Ashurst	Fletcher	Norbeck	Simmons
Bayard	Frazier	Overman	Swanson
Brookhart	Harris	Owen	Underwood
Broussard	Harrison	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Heflin	Ralston	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Randall	
Fess	Mayfield	Shields	
	Neely	Shipstead	

NAYS—50

Ball	Ferris	McKellar	Smith
Bingham	George	McKinley	Smoot
Borah	Gerry	McLean	Spencer
Bruce	Gooding	McNary	Stanfield
Bursum	Hale	Means	Sterling
Butler	Harrell	Metcalf	Wadsworth
Cameron	Howell	Moses	Walsh, Mont.
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Oddie	Warren
Couzens	Johnson, Minn.	Pepper	Watson
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Weller
Dale	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Willis
Dial	King	Sheppard	
Ernst	McCormick	Shortridge	

NOT VOTING—17

Curtis	Glass	Lenroot	Stephens
Edge	Greene	Norris	Trammell
Edwards	Jones, N. Mex.	Reed, Pa.	
Elkins	Ladd	Robinson	
Fernald	La Follette	Stanley	

So the Senate refused to sustain Mr. SWANSON's point of order that Title II of the bill down to section 217 is repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, which requires that revenue measures shall originate in the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MOSES. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS

Mr. MOSES. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, January 24, 1925, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 22), 1925

MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL FARM LOAN BOARD

Robert A. Cooper, of South Carolina, to be a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board, for a term of eight years expiring August 5, 1932. Mr. Cooper is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

VETERINARY CORPS

To be second lieutenant

Second Lieut. Ernest Eugene Hodgson, veterinary, Officers' Reserve Corps, with rank from January 15, 1925.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

SIGNAL CORPS

Capt. Alfred Marston Shearer, Infantry (detailed in Signal Corps), with rank from July 1, 1920.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE COLONELS

Lieut. Col. John Lawrence Bond, Infantry, from January 16, 1925.

Lieut. Col. Edward Raymond Stone, Infantry, from January 18, 1925.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS

Maj. William Francis Morrison, Field Artillery, from January 16, 1925.

Maj. Victor Sidney Foster, Cavalry, from January 18, 1925.

TO BE MAJORS

Capt. Michael Frank Davis, Air Service, from January 16, 1925.

Capt. John Fuller Davis, Cavalry, from January 18, 1925.

TO BE CAPTAINS

First Lieut. Christopher William Ford, Air Service, from January 16, 1925.

First Lieut. James Eugene Smith, Quartermaster Corps, from January 16, 1925.

First Lieut. Biglow Beaver Barbee, Finance Department, from January 18, 1925.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Second Lieut. Frank Joseph Vida, Infantry, from January 16, 1925.

Second Lieut. Harold Patrick Henry, Infantry, from January 16, 1925.

Second Lieut. Harry Woldren French, Infantry, from January 16, 1925.

Second Lieut. Dwight Joseph Canfield, Air Service, from January 18, 1925.

APPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY
TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Henry Dozier Russell, brigadier general Georgia National Guard.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Commander Donald C. Bingham to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1925.

Lieut. Commander Jere H. Brooks to be a commander in the Navy from the 17th day of October, 1924.

Lieut. Commander Samuel A. Clement to be a commander in the Navy from the 23d day of December, 1924.

Lieut. Commander Laurence Wild to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 8th day of June, 1923, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Lieut. Commander Herbert K. Fenn to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 25th day of July, 1923, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Lieut. Commander George D. Hull to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 28th day of July, 1923, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Lieut. Commander Harry P. Curley to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 29th day of July, 1923, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Lieut. Commander Paul Hendren to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 24th day of August, 1923, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Lieut. Commander Henry M. Briggs to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 5th day of October, 1923, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Lieut. Commander Paul Cassard to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 16th day of October, 1923, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Lieut. Commander Joseph Y. Dreisonstok to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 26th day of October, 1923, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Lieut. Commander Eric F. Zemke to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 29th day of December, 1923, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Lieut. Samuel S. Thurston to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1924.

Lieut. Albert G. Berry, jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 17th day of October, 1924.

Lieut. John M. Creighton to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 17th day of December, 1924.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Guy B. Hoover to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920.

Ensign Sterling T. Dibrell to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1924.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Rutledge B. Tompkins to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1923, to correct spelling of his name as previously nominated and confirmed.

Surg. William N. McDonell to be a medical inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 30th day of June, 1924.

Surg. George S. Hathaway to be a medical inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 10th day of November, 1924.

Asst. Surg. John M. Woodard to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 10th day of June, 1924, to correct spelling of his name as previously nominated and confirmed.

Boatswain Fred H. Stewart to be a chief boatswain in the Navy to rank with but after ensign from the 12th day of February, 1923.

Boatswain George E. Henning to be a chief boatswain in the Navy to rank with but after ensign from the 20th day of August, 1924.

Gunner Clarence E. Delp to be a chief gunner in the Navy to rank with but after ensign from the 20th day of November, 1924.

Machinist Albert Adams to be a chief machinist in the Navy to rank with but after ensign from the 20th day of September, 1924.

Machinist Eustace G. Wilson to be a chief machinist in the Navy to rank with but after ensign from the 21st day of October, 1924.

Pay Clerk William H. Hopkins to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy to rank with but after ensign from the 20th day of August, 1924.

Pay Clerk Oscar B. Bennett to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy to rank with but after ensign from the 20th day of April, 1924.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Samuel S. Greene to be postmaster at Reyno, Ark.. Office became presidential July 1, 1924.

ARIZONA

Freda B. Irwin to be postmaster at Gilbert, Ariz., in place of E. M. Lacy. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1924.

FLORIDA

Ernest C. Mahaffey to be postmaster at Quincy, Fla., in place of E. C. Mahaffey. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

GEORGIA

William M. McElroy to be postmaster at Norcross, Ga., in place of W. M. McElroy. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

Robert Turner to be postmaster at Jasper, Ga., in place of R. M. Edge. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Allie D. Griffin to be postmaster at Quitman, Ga., in place of W. R. Harrell. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

Robert L. O'Kelley to be postmaster at Grantville, Ga., in place of T. B. Banks. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Louis S. Marlin to be postmaster at Doerun, Ga., in place of L. S. Marlin. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1924.

John F. Charles to be postmaster at Chatsworth, Ga., in place of S. M. Barnett. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

ILLINOIS

Olga M. Streetz to be postmaster at River Grove, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

John M. Yoltan to be postmaster at Port Byron, Ill., in place of M. J. Yoltan, deceased.

Mildred E. Wright to be postmaster at Murrayville, Ill., in place of W. E. Wright, resigned.

IOWA

Ren S. Bosley to be postmaster at Newhall, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

Arthur M. Foster to be postmaster at Storm Lake, Iowa, in place of A. C. Smith, deceased.

Matt Olson to be postmaster at Clear Lake, Iowa, in place of J. C. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1924.

KANSAS

Uriah E. Heckert to be postmaster at Tescott, Kans. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Sheridan Crumrine to be postmaster at Longton, Kans., in place of F. N. Adams. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Lela Martin to be postmaster at Cherokee, Kans., in place of H. B. Price, removed.

KENTUCKY

John H. Meyer to be postmaster at Newport, Ky., in place of Alfred Gowling, deceased.

William T. Isaacs to be postmaster at Benham, Ky., in place of F. L. Coldwell. Incumbent's commission expired November 10, 1923.

MAINE

Susan M. Dyer to be postmaster at Harrington, Me., in place of W. N. Dyer, deceased.

MARYLAND

James C. Jones to be postmaster at Stevensville, Md. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

MICHIGAN

Harvey W. Raymond to be postmaster at Baraga, Mich., in place of H. W. Raymond. Appointee declined.

William J. Newton to be postmaster at Marysville, Mich., in place of F. T. Jackson, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Henry B. Young to be postmaster at Holt, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

Willie W. Bunday to be postmaster at Dennison, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

Marvin R. Christensen to be postmaster at Arco, Minn. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

MISSOURI

Ralph W. Day to be postmaster at Summersville, Mo., in place of Z. R. Baskett, removed.

MONTANA

Eliza J. Davis to be postmaster at Kevin, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Burt D. Young to be postmaster at Cossville, N. H. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

NEW JERSEY

William Griffin to be postmaster at Cresskill, N. J., in place of William Griffin. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Joseph B. Kronenberg to be postmaster at Bernardsville, N. J., in place of A. B. Gibb, deceased.

NEW YORK

Kenneth C. Steblen to be postmaster at Cape Vincent, N. Y., in place of F. J. Brady. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1924.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ophus L. Robertson to be postmaster at Leaksville-Spray, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

NORTH DAKOTA

John D. Greene to be postmaster at Edgeley, N. Dak., in place of W. S. Hancock, removed.

OHIO

Hattie B. Elliott to be postmaster at Trenton, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

OKLAHOMA

Abe H. Bergthold to be postmaster at Weatherford, Okla., in place of H. J. Dray. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Mollie E. McGinty to be postmaster at Ripley, Okla., in place of W. E. Baker, resigned.

OREGON

Mabelle N. Olds to be postmaster at Cloverdale, Oreg. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

PENNSYLVANIA

James G. Galbreath to be postmaster at Glassmere, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1923.

Daisy W. Shaw to be postmaster at Folcroft, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

Bertha N. Stiner to be postmaster at Moylan, Pa., in place of F. T. Stiner, deceased.

TEXAS

Mary A. Weimhold to be postmaster at Odell, Tex., in place of S. S. Farley, resigned.

VERMONT

Robert B. Thomas to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, Vt., in place of F. L. Start, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Samuel W. Collie to be postmaster at Danville, Va., in place of W. N. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired July 15, 1918.

WEST VIRGINIA

Earl Morris to be postmaster at Pursglove, W. Va., in place of H. A. Pettigrew, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 22), 1925.

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

John Matthews, jr., to be assistant director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

POSTMASTERS
VIRGINIA

Benjamin T. Culbertson, Dunganon.
Charles E. Black, Fordwick.
Willie R. Hall (Mrs.), Heathsville.
George W. Robinson, Raven.
Fred S. Bock, Roxbury.
Randall M. McGhee, Seven Mile Ford.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, January 23, 1925

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art our everlasting hope, at Thy footstool we offer Thee our grateful praise. Thou who canst hear the falling of a tear and the whisper of a breath, read our hearts, purify our purposes, and cleanse us from all hidden motives which are contrary to Thy holy will. As the work of life is too long and too arduous to be borne alone, we beseech Thee, O Lord, to direct us with Thy counsel and make plain for us the definite outlines of duty. Go with us through all the scenes of life and be with us when we reach the end. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, under instructions from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries I ask unanimous consent to refer back to that committee the bill S. 2930, No. 304 on the Union Calendar, an act to regulate radio.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that there be referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries a bill which the committee has reported. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER of Texas. As I understand it, the gentleman makes the statement that this is a unanimous request of the committee?

Mr. EDMONDS. It was taken up in the committee yesterday, and I did not hear a dissenting vote when the question was put.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AKTIESELSKABET MARIE DI GIORGIO

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8235) for the relief of Aktieselskabet Marie di Giorgio, a Norwegian corporation of Christiania, Norway, with a Senate amendment thereto, and move that the House agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this satisfactory to the Democratic conferees?

Mr. EDMONDS. I spoke to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] about it, and he is satisfied about it. There are no conferees.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. The bill has not gone to conference?

Mr. EDMONDS. It did not go to conference because we are agreeing to the Senate amendment. I talked to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box], and it is perfectly satisfactory. It simply gives our Government additional security.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JULIUS KAHN

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, February 22, be designated as a day for memorial services in memory of Hon. JULIUS KAHN, late a Representative from the fourth district of California.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that Sunday, February 22, be set aside for memorial services for Mr. KAHN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

A. W. SMITH

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, inadvertently the bill H. R. 6557, to allow credit in the accounts of A. W. Smith, was passed last evening instead of Senate bill 2316, the Senate bill being identical with the House bill. I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the House bill was passed be vacated and the Senate bill be considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the proceedings by which a House bill identical

with a Senate bill was passed be vacated and the Senate bill be considered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed, in the settlement of the accounts of A. W. Smith, fiscal agent, Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, to allow credit in the sum of \$111.75 now standing as a disallowance in said accounts on the books of the General Accounting Office, covering expenses incurred during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1917, in the erection of a building at the Bacon ranger station on the Klamath National Forest, Calif.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The House bill H. R. 6557 was laid on the table.

PITT RIVER POWER CO.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request as to the bill (H. R. 7053) for the relief of the Pitt River Power Co., and ask that the bill S. 2711, an identical bill, be considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to vacating the House proceedings and considering a similar Senate bill, S. 2711?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to adjust and settle the claim of the Pitt River Power Co. in the amount of \$1,767 paid to the United States and deposited with the Treasury, in connection with its application for a water-power permit on Pitt River, Calif., and to certify the same to Congress.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The House bill H. R. 7053 was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved bills of the following titles:

On January 13, 1925:

H. R. 9076. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide the necessary organization of the customs service for an adequate administration and enforcement of the tariff act of 1922 and all other customs revenue laws," approved March 4, 1923.

On January 14, 1925:

H. J. Res. 259. Joint resolution establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2309. An act for the relief of Robert Laird, sr.; and

H. R. 8906. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920.

On January 16, 1925:

H. R. 62. An act to authorize the appointment of an additional district judge in and for the district of Indiana and to establish judicial divisions therein, and for other purposes.

On January 17, 1925:

H. R. 10144. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force, the United States park police force, and the fire department of the District of Columbia," approved May 27, 1924.

On January 20, 1925:

H. R. 11308. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and prior fiscal years, to provide urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, and for other purposes.

On January 21, 1925:

H. R. 9804. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a commission authorized under certain conditions to refund or convert obligations of foreign governments held by the United States of America, and for other purposes," approved February 9, 1922, as amended February 28, 1923.

On January 22, 1925:

H. R. 10982. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3885. An act granting the consent of Congress to Harry E. Bovay, of Stuttgart, Ark., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Black River at or near the city of Black Rock, in the county of Lawrence, in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, presented a privileged report on the bill H. R. 518, the Muscle Shoals bill, which was referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LAGUARDIA reserved all points of order.

NATIONAL DISABLED SOLDIERS' LEAGUE (INC.)

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, presented a privileged report on H. Res. 412, authorizing the appointment of a special committee for the investigation of the National Disabled Soldiers' League (Inc.), which was referred to the House Calendar.

ARTICLE BY JOSEPH M. TRIGG, KNOXVILLE, TENN.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a short, but very interesting, article by a representative colored man on the bill H. R. 3228, known as the negro industrial commission bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an article that was written by Joseph M. Trigg, former alderman of Knoxville, Tenn., a newspaper correspondent, which is as follows:

[From the East Tennessee News, Knoxville, Tenn., Thursday, January 15, 1925]

CONGRESS TO CONSIDER IMPORTANT MEASURE AFFECTING BOTH RACES

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 12.—The Negro industrial commission bill (H. R. 3228) that is on the Union Calendar of the House of Representatives is one of the most important national measures that is pending before Congress.

Some national body to correlate and coordinate with a number of State interracial commissions that are doing splendid work throughout the country all agree. These various agencies are seriously handicapped in most instances for lack of funds; they are financed by public-spirited citizens who desire to promote racial understanding and friendly relationship in their respective communities.

This bill provides to "formulate a policy for mutual understanding and confidence between the races; to study the economic conditions of the Negro; to promote the general welfare of the Negro in industrial pursuits."

The commission would be empowered to make investigations and surveys covering the entire gamut of interracial endeavors in the United States, to the end to strengthen the ties of amity and good will everywhere.

A condition and not a theory underlies our race question. President Coolidge in his address to the Sixty-eighth Congress, the first session, recommended such legislation. At a public hearing before the House Judiciary Committee, April 10 and 11 and May 7, 1924, educators, publicists, and students of race problems testified that such a commission should be authorized.

It will be an interracial clearing house, where grievances and complaints will receive a sympathetic hearing and a righteous adjustment.

High patriotic motives have brought this question thus far with the hope it will spring into existence.

PENSIONS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 11749) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up an omnibus pension bill and asks unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Bridget M. McCarty, widow of Eugene McCarty, late of Company H, Second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma J. Mason, widow of Nathaniel H. Mason, alias Dennis Carroll, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Percy H. Allen, late of Company F, Second Battalion United States Engineers, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clarence E. West, alias Earl West, late of Company M, Forty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Donlevy, late of Company L, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas H. Stubbs, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Atwood P. Latham, late acting hospital steward, Hospital Corps, United States Army, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of John R. Sharp, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Calvin R. White, late scout and guide in Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Albert Long, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$18 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Fluegel, late of band, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Katharina Sparks, widow of Wesley R. Sparks, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward J. McCauley, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$18 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John G. Murphy, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$18 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Juvenile, late of Troop M, Third, and Troop D, Sixth Regiments United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary E. Gilland, former widow of John Gilland, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Archie McDonald, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$6 per month.

The name of Charles Brown, late of Company B, Twenty-third Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Samuel F. Brown, late of the Sixty-eighth Company United States Coast Artillery, Philippine insurrection, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Letcher Caudell, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Linna L. White, widow of Cassius G. White, late musician, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John E. Hanson, late of Company B, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Minnie Wolfe, widow of Charles H. Wolfe, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Philippine insurrection, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month and \$4 per month additional for each of the soldier's minor children until they shall attain the age of 16 years.

The name of I. J. Howard, late of Battery A, Second Regiment United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a

pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Pinlon, late of Company L, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Crawford Blair, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie Donaldson, dependent mother of Robert E. Donaldson, late of the United States ship *Mayflower*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edith L. Quick, widow of John Henry Quick, late sergeant major, United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of the compensation she is now receiving.

The name of James A. J. Yokum, late of Captain Ed. Sheffield's Company (A), Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Earnest J. Logan, late of Company D, Third Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Shannon, late of Troop B, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louisa W. Henderson, widow of John Henderson, late of Company K, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Infantry, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Evans, widow of Thomas C. Evans, late of the Marine Corps, United States Navy, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Albert M. Vance, late of Company G, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$6 per month.

The name of Edward P. Coan, late of Companies G, H, and I, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Millard A. Hammond, late of Company K, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret C. Cooper, widow of Raymond S. Cooper, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and \$2 per month additional on account of each minor child of the sailor until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Josephine M. Hayes, widow of Avery W. Hayes, late bandmaster, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan A. Bankston, widow of Jackson W. Bankston, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John M. Stephens, late of Company D, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John G. DeCamp, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James Burke, late of Battery A, First Regiment Maine Heavy Artillery, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$18 per month.

The name of Bartlett Sharp, late of Company G, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Hughes, late of Battery B, Utah Light Artillery, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving, said pension to be paid to soldier's duly appointed guardian.

The name of Weston A. Pattee, late captain of Company H, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Seth S. Crosby, late of Troop G, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leonard Merical, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sanford S. See, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-eighth Indiana Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry L. Wiessner, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment, United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Granville Burns, late of the Thirteenth Battery, United States Field Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bige Hubbard, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Eugene A. Rentz, late of Company K, Second Squadron, Cavalry, Georgia National Guard, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Cole, late of Battery H, Third Regiment United States Artillery, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Allen F. McAfee, late of Battery C, Pennsylvania Light Artillery, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary K. Stagle, widow of Gebhard Stagle, late of Troop H, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Frederick L. Eagle, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert L. Chick, late of Company G, Forty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, Philippine insurrection, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. Walker, late of Batteries H and O, Third Regiment United States Artillery, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$18 per month.

The name of Guy Warwick, late of Battery H, Second Regiment United States Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John G. Schempp, late of Company I, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Smith, widow of William I. Smith, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Don C. Haddock, late of Company B, Second Regiment Idaho National Guard, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Charles Andross, late of Company K, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emma Meckel, widow of Charles C. Meckel, late of Troop I, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Thomas Bond, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carrie Miller, widow of John Miller, late of Company A, Battalion Eighteenth Kansas Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hezekiah C. Cotner, late of Company D, Second Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William T. Lamme, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Burns, late of Company L, First Regiment United States Volunteer Engineers, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Cawood, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$6 per month.

The name of Lester Swanberg, late of Machine Gun Troop, First Regiment Illinois Cavalry, border defense, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Bert Myers, late of Company I, Twenty-second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a

pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Jevens, late of Company K, Second Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Nancy A. Sumner, widow of James Sumner, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara R. Wilson, widow of James Wilson, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Arria S. Sargent, dependent mother of Harry L. Sargent, late of Battery A, First Regiment Maine Heavy Artillery, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Susie Elgretta Henderson, helpless and dependent daughter of John B. Henderson, late of Troop F, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Hester P. Hart, remarried widow of William Stafford, late of Company H, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Henry B. Schenck, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Carl Olson, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Reuben B. Hyder, late of Company L, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rufus W. Jones, late of Company L, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Elizabeth Carson, widow of Robert Carson, late of Captain Conner's Company, Texas Mounted Volunteers, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella M. Shaffer, widow of Edward Shaffer, late of Troop C, First Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Abijah Eversole, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$6 per month.

The name of Frank M. Griffin, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Loreziar Walton, widow of Charles Allen, alias Percy Walton, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Benjamin F. Doxtater, late of Company H, First Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James B. Bently, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$6 per month.

The name of Jane C. Stinnett, widow of George I. Stinnett, late of Company G, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteers, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leo Pope Ott, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Cornelia H. Clopton, widow of Thomas Clopton, late of Captain John Field's company, Virginia Militia, War of 1812, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Conrad Nagel, late of Company A, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert L. Hedges, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Caroline de Witt Flagler, widow of Clement A. F. Flagler, late major general United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of any other pension or compensation to which she may be entitled, to be effective from and after May 6, 1925.

The name of Willard L. Anthony, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Essie Moore, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles N. Cannon, late of Company E, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Hall, late of Company M, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Laura Hendrickson, widow of George D. Hendrickson, late of Company K, Signal Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said George D. Hendrickson until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Benjamin F. Johnson, late of Company G, Signal Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert L. McFarland, late of Company M, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Esther Meece, late of Company H, Third Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joe H. Ross, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment United States Infantry, and Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Isaac Townsend, late of the Fourteenth Company United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary A. Wray, widow of Seaburn D. Wray, late of Troop M, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Reuben Waller, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clarence L. Wimer, late of Company A, Signal Corps, United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Andrew, late of Company K, Second Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Ralph Lotz, late of the U. S. S. *Maryland* and *Colorado*, United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Helena Bunt, mother of Joseph W. Bunt, late of Troop B, Thirteenth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William S. McGaha, late of Company F, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary P. McIntire, former widow of William B. Skinner, late of Company I, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Roy Elrod, late of Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Archie A. Warner, late of Company D, Thirty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles M. McDonald, late of Company H, Thirtieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laura G. Weisenburger, widow of John J. Weisenburger, late major First Regiment Washington Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Baldridge, former widow of George W. Berry, late of Company G, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, Mexican War, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William A. Rogers, late of Twenty-second Company United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$6 per month.

The name of Jennie E. Buckley, widow of Daniel J. Buckley, late first-class fireman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Tamar Ervin, dependent mother of Grover Cleveland Ervin, late seaman U. S. S. *Nina*, United States Navy, Regular Estab-

lishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hattie A. Cruson, widow of George W. Cruson, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Indian wars, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Albert S. Riddle, late of Troop I, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Silas Rogers, late of Company M, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward McCloskey, late of Company G, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Ormsby, late of Company G, Sixty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas P. Bright, late of Troop C, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Kate McGhehey, dependent mother of Warren C. McGhehey, late of the United States Navy, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth F. Hampton, dependent mother of Otto L. Hampton, late of Fourth Company, United States Coast Artillery, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles L. Berkheimer, late of Battery L, Third Regiment United States Artillery, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter S. Reynolds, late of Company I, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Antonio Alberto Madero, late of the United States Navy, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John G. MacFarlane, late of Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of David Ebner, late of Battery H, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Day, late of One hundred and twenty-first Company, United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Thomas E. Whalen, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, Philippine Insurrection, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Lanier, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company D, Second Regiment, United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Bert Walker, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Sholes, late of Troop E, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lee Byrd, dependent father of Clarence Byrd, late of Troop B, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Dudley, late of Company L, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William T. Hedges, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Kidder, late of Company H, First Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Laura Smith, widow of William Smith, late of Company A, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jesse T. Talmadge, late of Troop K, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Bierley, widow of James S. Bierley, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jesse M. Leverton, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Allen, widow of Joseph W. Allen, late of Company F, Twenty-fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Noah H. Stout, late of Company D, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Asa C. Pieratt, late of Troop I, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Donaghy, widow of Thomas Donaghy, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mortimer H. Cadwell, late of Company M, Forty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Egidius J. Fehr, late of Company M, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Paulinus G. Huhn, late of Company M, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, strike out lines 11 to 14, inclusive, being the name of William T. Lamme.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills, referred to said committee:

H. R. 889. Bridget M. McCarty.	H. R. 10000. Eugene A. Rentz.
H. R. 2775. Emma J. Mason.	H. R. 10002. William H. Cole.
H. R. 4005. Percy H. Allen.	H. R. 10004. Allen F. McAfee.
H. R. 4207. Clarence E. West.	H. R. 10019. Mary K. Stegle.
H. R. 4357. William C. Donlevy.	H. R. 10033. Frederick L. Eagle.
H. R. 4999. Thomas H. Stubbs.	H. R. 10037. Robert L. Chick.
H. R. 5027. Atwood P. Latham.	H. R. 10042. William B. Walker.
H. R. 5361. John R. Sharp.	H. R. 10043. Guy Warwick.
H. R. 6936. Calvin R. White.	H. R. 10058. John G. Schempp.
H. R. 7055. Albert Long.	H. R. 10059. Sarah E. Smith.
H. R. 8390. Martin Fluegel.	H. R. 10112. Don C. Haddock.
H. R. 8562. Katharina Sparks.	H. R. 10122. Charles Andross.
H. R. 8694. Edward J. McCauley.	H. R. 10125. Emma Meckel.
H. R. 8832. John G. Murphy.	H. R. 10180. William Thomas Bond.
H. R. 8989. Henry Juvenile.	H. R. 10185. Carrie Miller.
H. R. 9098. Mary E. Gilland.	H. R. 10203. Hezekiah C. Cotner.
H. R. 9103. Archie McDonald.	H. R. 10213. William T. Lamme.
H. R. 9147. Charles Brown.	H. R. 10233. James M. Burns.
H. R. 9152. Samuel F. Brown.	H. R. 10254. James M. Cawood.
H. R. 9203. Letcher Caudell.	H. R. 10262. Lester Swanberg.
H. R. 9208. Linna L. White.	H. R. 10264. Bert Myers.
H. R. 9236. John E. Hanson.	H. R. 10288. James R. Jevens.
H. R. 9282. Minnie Wolfe.	H. R. 10344. Nancy A. Sumner.
H. R. 9305. I. J. Howard.	H. R. 10390. Clara R. Wilson.
H. R. 9355. George W. Pinion.	H. R. 10399. Arria S. Sargent.
H. R. 9374. Crawford Blair.	H. R. 10420. Susie Elgretta Henderson.
H. R. 9473. Annie Donaldson.	H. R. 10432. Hester P. Hart.
H. R. 9662. Edith L. Quick.	H. R. 10429. Henry B. Schenck.
H. R. 9681. James A. J. Yokum.	H. R. 10442. Carl Olson.
H. R. 9682. Ernest J. Logan.	H. R. 10446. Reuben B. Hyder.
H. R. 9684. John Shannon.	H. R. 10448. Rufus W. Jones.
H. R. 9715. Louisa W. Henderson.	H. R. 10459. Mary Elizabeth Carson.
H. R. 9734. Sarah A. Evans.	H. R. 10464. Ella M. Shaffer.
H. R. 9742. Albert M. Vance.	H. R. 10513. Abijah Eversole.
H. R. 9830. Edward P. Coan.	H. R. 10517. Frank M. Griffin.
H. R. 9838. Millard A. Hammond.	H. R. 10538. Lorezlar Walton.
H. R. 9843. Margaret C. Cooper.	H. R. 10577. Benjamin F. Dextater.
H. R. 9844. Josephine M. Hayes.	H. R. 10655. James B. Bently.
H. R. 9856. Susan A. Bankston.	H. R. 10666. Jane C. Stinnett.
H. R. 9866. John M. Stephens.	H. R. 10675. Leo Pope Ott.
H. R. 9868. John G. De Camp.	H. R. 10695. Cornelia H. Clopton.
H. R. 9872. James Burke.	H. R. 10711. Conrad Nagel.
H. R. 9880. Bartlett Sharp.	H. R. 10801. Robert L. Hedges.
H. R. 9882. John W. Hughes.	H. R. 10809. Caroline De Witt-Flagler.
H. R. 9907. Weston A. Pattee.	H. R. 10817. Willard L. Anthony.
H. R. 9918. Seth S. Crosby.	H. R. 10825. Essie Moore.
H. R. 9945. Leonard Merical.	H. R. 10854. Charles N. Cannon.
H. R. 9951. Sanford S. See.	H. R. 10855. Edward Hall.
H. R. 9959. Henry L. Weissner.	
H. R. 9981. Granville Burns.	
H. R. 9984. Bige Hubbard.	

H. R. 10856. Laura Hendrickson.
H. R. 10857. Benjamin F. Johnson.
H. R. 10858. Robert F. McFarland.
H. R. 10859. Esther Meece.
H. R. 10861. Joe H. Ross.
H. R. 10862. Isaac Townsend.
H. R. 10863. Mary A. Wray.
H. R. 10897. Reuben Waller.
H. R. 10898. Clarence L. Wimer.
H. R. 10904. Samuel Andrew.
H. R. 10906. Ralph Lotz.
H. R. 10911. Helena Bunt.
H. R. 10926. William S. McGaha.
H. R. 10930. Mary P. McIntire.
H. R. 10935. Roy Elrod.
H. R. 10936. Archie A. Warner.
H. R. 10943. Charles M. McDonald.
H. R. 10960. Laura G. Welsenburger.
H. R. 10961. Mary A. Baldrige.
H. R. 10967. William A. Rogers.
H. R. 10995. Jennie E. Buckley.
H. R. 10996. Tamar Ervin.
H. R. 11007. Hattie A. Cruson.
H. R. 11018. Albert S. Riddle.
H. R. 11015. Silas Rogers.
H. R. 11039. Edward McCloskey.
H. R. 11041. John S. Ormsby.
H. R. 11042. Thomas P. Bright.

H. R. 11050. Kate McGhehey.
H. R. 11051. Elizabeth F. Hampton.
H. R. 11061. Charles L. Berkheimer.
H. R. 11088. Walter S. Reynolds.
H. R. 11106. Antonio Alberto Madero.
H. R. 11120. John J. MacFarlane.
H. R. 11121. David Ebner.
H. R. 11143. John M. Day.
H. R. 11162. Thomas E. Whalen.
H. R. 11186. William Lanier.
H. R. 11187. Bert Walker.
H. R. 11199. Frederick Sholes.
H. R. 11204. Lee Byrd.
H. R. 11224. John Dudley.
H. R. 11240. William T. Hedges.
H. R. 11300. Charles E. Kidder.
H. R. 11336. Laura Smith.
H. R. 11349. Jesse T. Talmadge.
H. R. 11374. Elizabeth Bierley.
H. R. 11385. Jesse M. Leverton.
H. R. 11395. Mary C. Allen.
H. R. 11431. Noah H. Stout.
H. R. 11439. Asa C. Pieratt.
H. R. 11561. Mary A. Donaghy.
H. R. 11603. Mortimer H. Cadwell.
H. R. 11710. Egidius J. Fehr.
H. R. 11711. Paulinus G. Huhn.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11753) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11753, with Mr. SNELL in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commercial attachés: For commercial attachés, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, after examination to be held under his direction to determine their competency and to be accredited through the State Department, whose duties shall be to investigate and report upon such conditions in the manufacturing industries and trade of foreign countries as may be of interest to the United States; and for the compensation of a clerk or clerks for each commercial attaché at the rate of not to exceed \$3,000 per annum for each person so employed, and for janitor and messenger service, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, rent outside of the District of Columbia, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, type-writing, adding, and computing machines, accessories and repairs, books of reference, and periodicals, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, newspapers (both foreign and domestic) not exceeding \$400, and all other publications, travel to and from the United States, and all other incidental expenses not included in the foregoing; such commercial attachés shall serve directly under the Secretary of Commerce and shall report directly to him, \$315,861: *Provided*, That not to exceed two commercial attachés employed under this appropriation may be recalled from their foreign posts and assigned for duty in the Department of Commerce without loss of salary.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 50, line 10, strike out the figures "\$315,861" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$390,861."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, last Tuesday I submitted some remarks upon the work of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce while this bill was under consideration under general debate. My attention has been called to the fact that in speaking of the formation of the bureau I made a mistake in stating that it was first formed under the recommendation of Secretary Redfield, under the Wilson administration. It was really formed by a combination of the Bureau of Manufactures and Statistics then in the Department of Commerce and Labor in August, 1912, and I think the chief credit is due to the then Representative and now Senator from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD, who was collaborating with the then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. John J. Fitzgerald, of New York, and also with the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Swagar Sherley, the ranking majority member of the committee.

The amendment which I have offered seeks to increase the appropriation for commercial attachés in the sum of \$75,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Tennessee has covered everything in his amendment, or are there one or two other amendments to follow?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; there are.

Mr. MADDEN. Why not present them all and have them pending so that we can discuss them at this time?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not going to offer all of them.

Mr. MADDEN. Somebody ought to offer them all. I ask unanimous consent that all amendments to this particular paragraph be offered at this time and be considered.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I notice one or two of the gentlemen who have amendments are not on the floor, though I think they will be in shortly, probably before I conclude.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose the gentleman from Tennessee has been in consultation with those gentlemen?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We have discussed the matter, since we are all greatly interested in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois present a request?

Mr. MADDEN. Unless the gentleman from Tennessee objects to it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. At this moment I think it would be inopportune to make the request.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I wanted to discuss this amendment and I am afraid I will not have time to do it, but I yield briefly.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. I just wanted to help the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I need assistance and I am always glad to have it from the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. The gentleman said that he could not conveniently present these amendments now on account of the absence of certain other gentlemen. I was going to volunteer to get them here, if he wants them.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, I am not asking the gentleman to make a point of no quorum.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Following up the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], I think the gentleman from Tennessee recognizes that since perhaps there might be amendments offered to other provisions of the bill, they are so connected with it, that it would be well to have them considered together.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have no objection to that.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. These different activities are so allied together that the separate amendments which I understand are to be offered could be well considered together.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have no objection to that, provided time can be given. I would not want four or five amendments considered with time to discuss only one.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I think we should have a full, fair, and clear understanding of what is before us. If the gentleman would have all of his amendments offered at one time, then we may be able to arrange time for debate. We want to be liberal, and if the whole proposition is in front of us, then we will know exactly what to do.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am interested in this bureau, particularly with reference to its foreign work, and the amendment which I offer relates to the work it is doing in foreign countries. There are four or five amendments relating to paragraphs in the bill which have to do with the foreign service of this bureau, but I am not desirous of offering all those amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3509) to change the time for the holding of terms of court in the eastern district of South Carolina.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3585. An act granting the consent of Congress to Harry E. Bovay, of Stuttgart, Ark., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Black River at or near the city of Black Rock, in the county of Lawrence, in the State of Arkansas.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR

The committee again resumed its session.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, the gentleman knows I am not going to object. I desire to offer this suggestion: I want to talk on this subject myself and I want to present every phase of the bureau's activities as clearly as I may be able to do it, and it will take me about 30 minutes to do what I want to do, and I would like to have enough time allotted to those who want to speak on either side of this case so we will have a real picture of it when we get through, and if the gentleman from Tennessee will not object—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. What time?

Mr. MADDEN. I want 30 minutes myself, and I do not know how much the gentleman wants.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There are other gentlemen who want time.

Mr. MADDEN. And they ought to have it. Say, take an hour on a side.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Further reserving the right to object, I want some time on this proposition.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not think two hours will be sufficient.

Mr. MADDEN. Say three hours, so as to make it right.

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Make it four hours.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman from Tennessee made a very interesting statement on Tuesday, and he suggested in that statement there would be amendments offered which would increase the appropriation for that part in the bill approximately \$390,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman, following up what I said to the gentleman from Pennsylvania a moment ago, I do not care to offer amendments relating to anything except the Foreign Service, and the amendments I have in mind amount to about \$315,000.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The point I had in mind was this: There will possibly be some amendments in addition to those the gentleman mentioned that would be kindred to the same subject, and as they all relate to the same subject they could well be reported here so we could consider them altogether and devote something like three hours to it.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the motion now pending, and all amendments thereto, be limited to three hours, and that the time shall be controlled, one-half by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and the other half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments relating to this same subject shall be limited to three hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Alabama. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would like to know where the gentleman from Alabama stands on this amendment. I would not like to have the time entirely controlled by gentlemen who are opposed to this amendment, with all due deference to my friend.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will yield time allotted to me to those who are in favor of the amendment, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania will control time of those who are opposed to the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As I understand of this request of the gentleman for three hours an hour and a half of time will be given to those who are in favor of the amendment and an hour and a half to those who oppose it?

Mr. SHREVE. That is correct.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will get the gentleman from Tennessee to suggest to me to whom time shall be allotted, because I really am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think we ought to have it understood as to what this time is intended to cover. I understand the understanding to be that we are to have all amendments to this general subject relating to foreign and domestic commerce submitted now?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Chair's understanding.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And have the amendments read so they can all be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendments will be pending. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WINGO. I desire to suggest this, Mr. Chairman, that the agreement ought to include this; the right of gentlemen to submit in their own time their proposed amendments that they intend to have voted on because it may not be possible to offer all in that time, there being so many of them. I think it should be understood that in their own time they can read their amendments and discuss them that they intend to offer at the conclusion of the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that is proper. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will be recognized.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I would suggest that those having amendments speak first so we can have the amendments before the committee, and I will yield such time as those who wish to offer amendments desire and we have the amendments read now.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments ready to be presented under this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As I understand under the unanimous consent agreement amendments can be offered at any time before the close of debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands so. Are there any amendments ready to be offered now and have them before the committee. If not, the gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for such time as the gentleman from Alabama yields?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to take issue with the splendid subcommittee which prepared this bill. They are gentlemen in whom we all have great confidence and for whom we all have very great respect. I have always followed the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN] in his splendid and most serviceable efforts in behalf of economy; and if I did not feel so very strongly on this subject, I would not now offer an amendment to this bill seeking to increase the appropriation, which I feel is absolutely essential to the proper functioning of this great Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

We all know that before the war Germany had what might be called a commercial supremacy in many of the countries, not only in the Southern Hemisphere but in other portions of the world. Germany was said to be commercially supreme in South America and in Mexico and in Central America, and Germany secured that supremacy during the years before the war by establishing foreign agents in those countries for the purpose of seeking German trade; agents whose duty it was to investigate and find out just where German products could be sold and to advise the foreign service in Germany, so that the foreign service could in turn advise German manufacturers and business men as to where they could secure the best markets for that which they had to sell, giving them information as to the kind and quality of products which would be best salable in those countries and how to pack and ship those products. Great Britain followed the same plan, though not to so intensive a degree. France was engaged in the same enterprise, and that was largely the reason for our establishing the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in August, 1912.

In 1914 the war came on. The supremacy which Germany had enjoyed, the great trade which was going from South America and Mexico and other countries to Europe, fell into the lap of America. One thing is certain, my friends. We can not hope to retain that trade; we can not possibly hope to garner more trade, unless we meet the efforts that are now being made by those European countries to regain the trade which they enjoyed before the war. These big commercial countries of Europe are carrying on an intensive campaign to increase their foreign trade. Great Britain is doing much more than we are. Can we afford to lag behind at this crucial period of the world's trade?

It is true that if a jobber in this country has men upon the road who are seeking out trade for his business, those who are in competition with him must do the same or they will go into bankruptcy. And certainly, it seems to me, that the United States can not afford to withhold from this bureau the amount of money necessary to enable it to function and to hold its own with European countries which are now reaching out through their foreign services to regain the trade they once enjoyed.

We are told on the best of authority that already Germany is now commercially supreme in Mexico, and if you do not do something toward giving this foreign service of ours opportunity to bring to the attention of countries in South America and in Europe and the Far East the value of American products, the kind and quality of American products, and information to manufacturers and those who supply those commodities in this country as to where they can sell their products, then as certainly as you sit where you do, my friends, we are not

going to keep pace, as we should by reason of our great resources, with our competitors.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. It is essential, is it not, from the fact that we are now trying to put our flag on the seas and carry our goods to the four corners of the earth by our merchant marine?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. The gentleman's suggestion is exceedingly apropos. How are you going to maintain a merchant marine if you do not cultivate the foreign trade of our country? How long do you think a jobber in this country would exist in his business if he failed to meet the competition of other jobbers who have their men upon the road who are giving the trade information as to what the jobber has to sell? That is the whole proposition in a nutshell; so simple, it seems to me, that there is no room for argument against it.

I lay down this as a proposition: These hearings are brief. I am making no criticism of that. They are valuable and informative. I say that if you will read the hearings showing what this bureau has done and what it is trying to do and how it proposes to increase foreign trade, you will realize that it has not sufficient funds to-day to do what it ought to do, and I do not believe any of you will oppose a reasonable appropriation for this bureau.

Take the amendment I have offered in the first instance. I have moved to increase the appropriation for commercial attachés by \$75,000. What will that do? We have now only 14 commercial attachés throughout the world. This \$75,000 will not give the bureau what it ought to have. It will not give the bureau the number it says it ought to have, but it only provides for three more officers.

Mr. Director Klein stated, in response to a question from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE], that the commercial attaché offices proposed to be opened under his program, but which will not be opened on account of insufficient funds, are at Dublin; Budapest, Hungary; Berne, Switzerland; Christiania, Norway; Toronto; Guayaquil, Ecuador; La Paz, Bolivia, and possibly Caracas and one or two other South American and Central American cities. My amendment provides for only three of these offices. Inasmuch as this is such a great revenue-producing agent for the Government, can we afford at this time, when other countries are reaching out for foreign trade—can we now take a backward step and fail to give to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce at least a part, if not all, of the funds which they say is necessary to garner this trade; not only to get more trade, but to actually retain the trade we now have?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask for three minutes more.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield for a brief question.

Mr. BLANTON. Do I understand the gentleman to say that these commercial attachés will cost \$25,000 apiece?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, \$75,000 will produce three of them.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will explain that to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I wish the gentleman would do so, because I want to be with him.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. These commercial attachés are paid salaries ranging from \$6,500 to \$9,000 per annum. There are just a few at \$9,000, but that is the general range of the salaries of these commercial attachés. In addition to their salaries they must have, of course, rent; they must have heat and light; they must have clerical employees, and then there must be services rendered here in the District of Columbia to take care of the work which they bring to the bureau by reason of their location in foreign countries. So it is stated that a commercial attaché's office means an expenditure—for the salary of the commercial attaché, all employees and all incidentals—of from \$21,000 to \$25,000, and that is the reason I stated that this \$75,000 increase would only mean three additional offices of this kind.

Now, gentlemen, I have not the time to discuss this amendment, and I have not the time to go into many of the facts. I wish I could. I wish I had the opportunity to call your attention to some of the facts stated by Director Klein in the hearings. Let me call your attention to some of them.

In speaking of the necessity on having a commercial attaché in Dublin, he said:

We recently lost, as a direct result of our not having a trade commissioner or an attaché in Ireland to look after our affairs there

and watch opportunities, a contract which will probably run well in excess of \$15,000,000. That contract would probably have come into American hands had there been an American commercial attaché there. It may not be too late to save the day if we are authorized to establish that office; but at present the situation is such as to tend very strongly in the direction of a powerful European competitor.

Another illustration is in one of the South American countries in which we have no office. An \$18,000,000 contract was let for some important public works, and the first we knew of it was when the president of that republic signed a decree. Now, it is the business of the commercial attachés and the trade commissioners to head off things of that sort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. May I have two more minutes?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield the gentleman two more minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Again quoting from the statement made by Director Klein:

Just three days ago I had a letter from a large construction company describing what our Athens office had been able to do for them. A \$10,000,000 contract for public works, for a water system and drainage for Athens, Piraeus, and that whole section, was let to an American company, and that company was good enough to say that a good deal of the credit for that—not all of it, of course, but a good deal—was due to our commercial attaché in Athens. It was a very conspicuous concrete result of the work of our service there.

Now, gentlemen, this hearing is full of statements regarding lesser amounts of business that have been secured by the commercial attachés and the trade commissioners in this great service. It is a great revenue producer for the Government. It is estimated that last year this bureau brought new business, new foreign business, to our country amounting to \$529,000,000 in contracts and supplies furnished as the result of information secured by these foreign representatives in foreign countries and communicated by them to the service here and in turn promptly communicated to those who were in a position to handle that business and to derive a profit from it. I say it is a plain business proposition, and one, my friends, which I do not believe the increase asked here will sufficiently meet, but certainly by this increase we will do something to show that we are interested in the general prosperity of this country, for what benefits the manufacturer, what benefits the business man, and what benefits the exporter of this country, benefits everybody. It gives better opportunities for labor; it gives better markets for our agricultural products, and it is for that reason that I feel so earnestly upon this subject. I hope that these five amendments carrying, as they will, probably \$300,000, or a little more, will be voted into this bill, so that this bureau may be able to meet some of the demands which are now being made upon it, and which it is absolutely unable to meet because it has not the funds with which to meet them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five minutes. Gentlemen of the House, I am sure there is not a man within the sound of my voice who does not know that the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be the chairman has been consistent in its efforts for several years to assist and build up this Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and it has been a great satisfaction to us to know that this bureau has been able to go into at least 25 countries of the world, until to-day we are exporting \$3,000,000 worth of goods every day. But, gentlemen, I want to say to you that I find myself in a position where I can not agree with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. I feel the time has come when we should limit our appropriations here, because the country is clamoring for that; it is demanding it, and in almost every paper to-day we see the cry of "pork barrel" about this and the cry of "pork barrel" about that. I am happy to say, however, that there has never been a charge that there is any pork barrel with reference to the appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The only thing is the desire upon the part of the people to have a reduction in taxes, and how can you expect to have a reduction in taxes if you are going to raise appropriations all the time?

This bureau is doing a most wonderful work, and I would not curtail that work for a single instance, but with the splendid organization the bureau now has for bringing to our country large contracts and enabling this country to export goods to the value of \$3,000,000 per day, the bureau can continue along that line indefinitely without any increase in appropriations.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Is this not true—that our country and our manufacturers are asking for an extension of our foreign trade?

Mr. SHREVE. They are asking for it; yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. If we do not have commercial attachés in foreign countries to get that business, how are we going to extend our foreign trade?

Mr. SHREVE. As I say, we are now exporting \$3,000,000 worth of goods per day, and I think that is a pretty good business.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. But we want more if we can get it.

Mr. SHREVE. We are satisfying the people; the people are all satisfied, and this is simply propaganda that is going over the country. Nobody came before our committee asking to have this appropriation increased; there was no recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget that this appropriation be increased, and nobody has spoken to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee about increasing this appropriation. Where does it come from? I say it is simply a question of propaganda.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman permit me to make an observation?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman said something about a demand for a reduction of taxes. Does not the gentleman think that increased business necessarily means an increase of wealth and thus a reduction in taxes?

Mr. SHREVE. Well, that is a deep financial problem which I will not attempt to discuss at this time.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The President seems to think that way about those things.

Mr. SHREVE. Now, gentlemen, I want to say another thing to you. This is just one of the many activities handled by this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. We have got to look at the proposition fairly and we have to look at every angle of it.

We have the great Department of State, which has now been reorganized under the Rogers bill, with 642 representatives scattered all over the world, and now there are 100 other cities demanding that we have consular representation there. You know that these men are also assisting in gathering statistics, and every day they furnish information to the Department of Commerce. We have not been able to increase this great force of the Department of State by a single dollar of increased appropriation. The only thing we have given them is an appropriation for a vault in order to take care of their most valuable documents.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Just a few moments ago the gentleman made some reference to propaganda.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Has the gentleman any information that he would be willing to give more than that which he indicated at the time he made mention of it?

Mr. SHREVE. I will say it only comes from a stack of letters and telegrams which we have all received from all over the United States urging us to vote for the Byrns amendment. It looks to me like propaganda.

Mr. KETCHAM. Would the gentleman be willing to read one of those letters or telegrams, without giving, possibly, the names of those who send the telegrams or letters, in order that we may have the general tenor of the appeal?

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Certainly.

Mr. REED of New York. The wording of practically all of them is the same, is it not?

Mr. SHREVE. They are practically in the same language.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk may read the telegram which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 21, 1925.

Hon. MILTON W. SHREVE,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The American Manufacturers' Export Association, on behalf of its members, desires to record its whole-hearted support to the amendment to be offered by Hon. JOSEPH W. BYRNS of Tennessee giving the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce additional appropriations in keeping with its needs for expansion to meet the requirements placed upon it by American business. This association hopes that Congress will act favorably on this amendment.

O. C. ROACH,

Secretary American Manufacturers' Export Association.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five minutes more.

Mr. MOONEY. Will the gentleman permit an interruption a moment?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. MOONEY. I understood the gentleman to say that the consular officers reported to the Department of Commerce the information which they got.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. MOONEY. Is that report made direct to the Department of Commerce?

Mr. SHREVE. It is made first to the Department of State and then sent over to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MOONEY. Is it not a fact that often the information arrives at the Department of Commerce too late to be of any value to the exporters and manufacturers?

Mr. SHREVE. Not always; no.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Will the gentleman permit just one further question?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Can the gentleman give the House any idea of the amounts expended for this sort of work by our Government as compared with the amounts expended by other nations that are reaching out for world business? For instance, take Great Britain; does the gentleman know whether we spent as much as Great Britain for this sort of work?

Mr. SHREVE. I am not able to make a complete statement about that now, because I have not the figures here. Of course, we all know that Great Britain has a wonderful organization all over the world.

Mr. McDUFFIE. And has a wonderful world trade.

Mr. SHREVE. We are ready to admit that, but we also have a wonderful organization all over the world. We are getting along well, and we should stop and think about these other departments that are just as much in need of money as this department.

This committee has to be fair about these matters. We look at the Department of Commerce, we look at the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, we look at the Department of State, and we must look at all these activities with exactly the same eyes and with the same thought, which is to render the best service we can to all of them. We have to equalize and divide these appropriations up. I wish I had the time to tell you about many of these other things.

For instance, there is the Bureau of Standards. We have received many letters from all over the United States, written in a friendly sort of way, about the Bureau of Standards, and yet there is no propaganda to increase the appropriations for the Bureau of Standards.

Referring again to the matter of propaganda, the telegram which you have just heard read clearly indicates it is propaganda. It was sent out when? I have had it three or four days and before anybody knew anything about the Byrns amendment except those who were on the inside.

Mr. WURZBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WURZBACH. I have a great deal of confidence in the good judgment of the head of the Department of Commerce. Does the Department of Commerce recommend this increase?

Mr. SHREVE. The Department of Commerce has never said anything to the committee about it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that both Secretary Hoover and Director Klein stated to the committee that while, of course, they were not in a position to ask that the Budget estimates be increased, yet they absolutely could not function and dispose of present business under 32 days, and in some instances 4 months, unless they got more money.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, that same thing ran all through the hearings. There was the statement that they needed more money; but as I have said, these specific items referred to by the gentleman and by others who intend to offer amendments, were not referred to.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Is there any suspicion on the part of anyone that this is an effort on the part of large exporting concerns to have the Government pay their advance agents, so that they can avoid the necessity of having foreign salesmen abroad?

Mr. SHREVE. I am not of that opinion, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa. I think these large export concerns in a good many instances have their own men in foreign countries. This is just a general service and I am not criticizing the service at all.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman any information as to the manner by which these export manufacturers learned of this Byrns amendment?

Mr. SHREVE. I am not able to answer the gentleman. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have three additional amendments which I desire to present at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee presents amendments at this time for the information of the House.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that others who have amendments should send them up and have them read from the desk at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are any other Members who have amendments to offer at this time they should be sent to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the various amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments proposed by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 51, lines 4 and 6, strike out "\$432,600" and "\$53,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$492,600" and "\$75,000."

On page 52, line 14, strike out "\$248,040" and "\$99,080" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$308,040" and "\$120,000."

Page 54, line 7, strike out the figures "\$575,404" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$635,404."

Amendment proposed by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Page 53, lines 7 and 8, strike out "\$243,734" and "\$95,771" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$303,734" and "\$115,000."

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MacLafferty].

Mr. MacLafferty. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in this question because the whole training of my life has been in commerce and business. A question was asked of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Shreve], who just had the floor, as to whether or not there might be a suspicion in the minds of some one that the business interests of the country were seeking to have the Government pull their chestnuts out of the fire, or words to that effect. I feel that I can speak to you with some degree of knowledge, because I have been in foreign countries looking for American business. I had opportunities to see at those times that our prestige as a Nation handling foreign business was very low. At the time I went to the Orient looking for business there were nine American ships running overseas under the American flag, and the rest of our commerce abroad—and it was small—was handled in foreign bottoms. To illustrate what I mean when I say American prestige was very low and that there was very little respect for American business standing among foreigners, I shall relate to you a little incident. When I was a boy I heard my father tell many times about a trip that he made to China in 1868. At that time I have heard him say that almost the only flag he saw in the China Sea was the American flag on our wonderful clipper ships. When I went to China and was gone for four months I saw the American flag afloat only four times after I left Honolulu. Once was on the old steamship *China*, for years owned and operated by the Pacific Mail Steamship Co. but at that time owned by Chinese. Another was on our old American flagship *Brooklyn*, which was lying in the Whang-Po River at Shanghai. She has now been torn to pieces and junked, and she should have been long before I saw her. When I tell you about the third time that I saw the American flag I want also to tell you how an American feels when he sees his country held up to ridicule by a foreigner in a foreign country.

Coming back from China I was a passenger on a Canadian Pacific steamship, because there was no American steamship within two weeks of the time I had to return. We had been at sea about 10 days and had sighted nothing, because the north Pacific Ocean is a very lonely place. One morning we saw ahead of us a little smudge on the horizon, and we all began to wonder what it was. We were all interested. It was the first thing that we had seen since we had left the coast of Japan. Our captain was a good-natured, typical British seaman. He had a good broad neck and a good cockney accent. I remember how we were all gathered around him on the deck, and as that

little smudge began to enlarge, he looking through the glass, was telling us what he saw. All of a sudden some colors broke out from the peak of that vessel, and he said to us, "Well, by Jove, she is an American." There was a little, dirty, old steam schooner bobbing up and down on the waves of the Pacific like a cork, and she signaled to us afterwards that she was on her way to Japan with timbers for props in mines. Do you know what the jolly skipper said right after he made the observation that she was an American? He said—and they all laughed when he said it—"I wonder what she is doing so far from shore."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacLafferty. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it not a fact that all of the principal competitive nations with the United States have agents who are reporting to the countries in which they are located the business their country is in a position to transact, both in food and manufactured products?

Mr. MacLafferty. Decidedly.

Mr. MORGAN. And is it not a fact that those of us who export have to look out for markets by our own agents?

Mr. MacLafferty. That is true. I want to tell of another incident. In the city of Shanghai, in what was called the American Bank, I want to show how American interests were looked after and by what manner of men—and this is not referring to their moral character or to their ability. One of the clerks in the American Bank at Shanghai was a typical British "clerk," as they speak of clerks. He was very polite. I used to think that he was very obsequious. After each steamer came in I went to the bank to get my mail. The steamer came in one day, and I went in and got my mail, and the next day, passing, I thought that perhaps there was something else and I would go in and ask again. I went to the young man, and I said, "Is there any more mail for me?" And he bowed very low and was very polite and assured me that there was no more mail—a typical British clerk looking after American interests. I thought I would have a little fun with him and did not stop to think that perhaps he would not understand what we call American humor.

After the evidence of his obsequiousness I said, "I accept your apology." He straightened up and said, "I did not apologize, sir." That is how American ideas are understood in many foreign countries. I was over in China selling paper, a commodity that every civilized being and many half-civilized beings use. I was over there trying to drum up business without the aid of any governmental agency, and I tell you that it is a hard job. But, let me tell you, when our Government designates a man and sends him abroad as a commercial attaché, he can explore unknown channels with a prestige that the representative of American business houses does not have.

And this morning I find myself with the opportunity of making these observations on a question that is absolutely non-partisan. There is not a man in this House who is not desirous of promoting American trade abroad, or possibly that little factory in his home town is now or looking forward to the time they will be able to ship goods beyond our borders. Our business prestige abroad has been low, and this is the one business institution connected with our Government that gives prestige abroad that will keep our flag upon the seas. Remembering that the happiness of a country is founded upon its business and its commercial prosperity, we should be very wise in our vote here to-day to see that everything is done that can be done to build up American prestige abroad, particularly in the sale of our merchandise.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MacLafferty. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. I give credit to the distinguished gentleman from California for his interest in our foreign commerce. I am glad the gentleman made his speech to-day, because there are some Members here who were not present in the committee last year and did not hear the incident he has related concerning our shipping.

Mr. MacLafferty. I related the incident about the American flag, knowing it had been done before, and I related it because I think it illustrates the point. I am sure my friend from Texas appreciates it. But I know this, that I have not related it well enough so you can understand the feeling of humiliation that was in my heart at the time I had a part in it.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman succeeded in passing the amendment the last time, and I am afraid he is going to pass it again.

Mr. MacLafferty. My friend is mistaken in his theology, because I mentioned it two years ago on the ship subsidy bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MacLafferty. May I have two minutes?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. If it is a crime for a little factory in your home town, which is handling the business of the country, asking Members of Congress to do everything they can to stimulate trade with foreign lands so that they can enlarge their activities and have bigger facilities and bring prosperity to the community, if it is a crime, then I approve of such crime. I have not yet felt it is one for a commercial house in New York City or an organization of manufacturers or a labor organization or any organization that exists for legitimate purposes writing or wiring asking Congressmen to do what they can for the protection and enlargement of that trade.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. I will.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. The gentleman knows we had a trade balance last year of more than \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. A little more than that.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Does the gentleman know of any other nation that anything like approaches that balance of trade in their favor?

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. I can not say as to that, but we had a home trade of something like \$45,000,000,000. I will say to my friend from Texas that is very good as far as we have gone if we do not slip backwards. Let us keep on going because that balance last year ought to have been double what it was. It should be this coming year. I am not here trying to put the Budget out of business. That is not the point at all. I saw an opportunity this morning to make these observations, and I do not expect to have many more opportunities to make observations here, so I took advantage of that opportunity to talk about something about which I know a little. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am very much interested, and have been for many years, in this question of foreign trade. It has been my privilege to see a great many countries and to see the operations of Americans in those countries as well as foreigners who are nationals in the respective countries that I visited. I am certainly heartily in favor of an increase when it can be normally done, but I believe it is being normally done and extraordinarily done by the Department of Commerce with the money that they have had at their disposal. I took the liberty the other day, with the permission of the House, to insert in the Record a few instances given by Doctor Klein as to what they had accomplished during the last year and how the business of that office is increasing. I also placed in the Record the number of inquiries that they had received dealing on various topics, and they will be able with the money that they have this year to do all that they have been doing in the past and something more, because we have given them an additional office and we have given them some additional money. Now, the gentleman from California [Mr. MACLAFFERTY], who last spoke, mentioned the trade of the Far East, and in the supplement to the Commerce Reports published by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce which I have in my hand it is shown that our foreign trade with China in 1910 and 1914 was \$31,390,000; in 1922 it was \$127,008,000; and in 1923 it was \$134,881,000, showing that there is a very substantial increase there.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman, I believe, has recently been in China. Can he tell us at what points in China we now maintain commercial attachés?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I could not answer that offhand.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Can you give us any information as to the attitude of Secretary Hoover on this question? Does he want this additional appropriation?

Mr. ACKERMAN. He mentioned the subject generally. Of course, as the chairman of the subcommittee explained, he did not want to say anything that would impeach the figures given by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Is it your opinion that Secretary Hoover would welcome these additional appropriations?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I suppose any head of an executive department could use additional funds. But it is all with the idea of harmonizing the situation, so that the increases will not run over the Budget estimate, in order that taxes may ultimately be reduced.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. KNUTSON. How does the appropriation carried in this bill compare with the appropriation made for the Foreign Trade Bureau in the bill of a year ago?

Mr. ACKERMAN. As I understand it, in this particular item there is \$37,725 more.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is that in proportion to the increase of our foreign trade, would the gentleman say?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I would not say exactly that, because our foreign trade increased in 1924 as compared with 1923 from 200 to 250 per cent. Our balance of exports over imports in 1923 was \$376,000,000, and in 1924 it was \$1,075,000,000, or about three times as much.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman think that the representatives we have abroad have been largely instrumental in building up this trade?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes; in my remarks on January 20, I printed extracts from the hearings, showing the excellent work done by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. With pleasure.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am sure the gentleman will agree that the importance of the work done by this bureau depends on the rapidity with which it can get this information to those who need it in this country. Is it not a fact that Director Klein, supported by Mr. Hoover, who was seated at his side at the time, stated that in some instances they were four months behind; in the foodstuffs division 32 days behind, and if they shut down on all this work they would be 32 days behind?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Well, business is always behind in the departments. It is not quite current.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Is not that true for the four months?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HUDSON. Has it been suggested where these additional officers might be placed?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes; it has been suggested in the hearings.

Mr. HUDSON. They were suggested as critical places for the development of trade?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Yes; the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] mentioned them this morning.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; I read the 10 places where they wanted them, as stated in the hearings.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman himself is an extensive manufacturer, is he not, and has been for years, and he does not think this \$75,000 is necessary?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I do not for the moment.

Mr. BLANTON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HUDSON. Has the department suggested that they need at this time the additional appropriation?

Mr. ACKERMAN. They admitted that the increase that the Budget was giving them was too slight, and stated that wonderful results had been obtained from the increase last year. Therefore we thought that if, by the slight increase last year, they had obtained such favorable results, there was no reason why they could not have the same amount this year. We did not cut them down under the estimates of the Budget.

I took the Statistical Abstract, the last edition, and I went through it, and I discovered that there were 32 countries in the world whose exports exceeded their imports; and I find that in 1922 there were only 12 countries whose exports exceeded their imports, but in 1923, the latest figures available show that the amount of the excess of exports over imports of 32 countries in the aggregate was \$1,286,000,000. If we leave out British India; their exports over imports being very favorable at the present time, that is in 1923, by the sum of \$312,000,000, but the excess of exports of the United States for 1924 was more than that of all the other countries of the world combined. Think of that!

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CROWTHER. Then we would be led to believe from those figures that the Fordney-McCumber bill, which some of our friends on the other side opposed in the last campaign

as being detrimental to our foreign commerce, was not such a producer of bad business abroad as they claimed?

Mr. ACKERMAN. The gentleman is correct from his standpoint, but I am speaking from an entirely nonpartisan standpoint. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS] 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I assure you I have great hesitancy in opposing my friend Mr. SHREVE, the chairman of this subcommittee, and I do so only because I am fully convinced that this little additional item for trade commissioners would bring returns of a hundredfold; and I believe whenever we can turn \$1 loose that will expand our foreign commerce \$100, or that will make markets for \$100 worth of American farm products, that is economy and not extravagance. The additional business will actually help to carry the tax burden in the United States. It reaches to raw products from the farm, and manufactures, and labor, and to every citizen.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. For the information of the House, will the gentleman state how many commercial attachés this \$75,000 will maintain, and where it is proposed to put them? At what points is it proposed to place them?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] that this amendment, if adopted, will provide for three additional commercial attachés. On page 9 of the hearings, Director Klein stated that there were 10, and possibly one or two other countries, in which he would like to appoint additional commercial attachés. Of course, it will be up to Secretary Hoover and Director Klein as to where these men will be located.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman read to us some of the important points showing the necessity for these additional commercial attachés. We do not have the hearings before us.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I shall be glad to do that. The value of the American trade with the Far East—and that is our great undeveloped field—has increased 235 per cent since 1914. American investments there have increased fourfold over 1914, jumping from one-quarter of a billion dollars at that time to one billion in 1924. The inquiries on the Far East, handled by the bureau during the first six months of 1924, numbered 111,633, as against 53,136 for the corresponding period of 1923, an increase, therefore, of 110 per cent. As rapidly as funds are made available new offices for trade commissioners should be opened in the Far East as follows: Hankow, Harbin, Tientsin, China; Singapore, Straits Settlement; Soerabaya, Dutch East Indies, Rangoon, Burma; Colombo, Ceylon; Kobe, Japan; Auckland, New Zealand; and Sydney, Australia.

Hankow, exporting to the United States \$14,000,000 annually, is the distributing center of central China trade and is 600 miles by boat from the nearest bureau office. Where we are purchasing \$14,000,000 worth of Chinese products there is an opportunity to sell and there is a chance to barter. So we must have our agents at that point. That only is good, common business sense.

There appears in the hearings letters received from different manufacturing concerns and exporting firms that read something like this: There went to South America \$75,000 worth of wire. That grew out of this service. To Egypt, \$300,000 worth of coal. That resulted from this service. Forty thousand dollars worth of lumber went to Costa Rica; \$20,000 worth of hosiery; \$10,000 worth of foodstuffs; another \$28,000 worth of coal; lumber from Seattle, and so on through.

Now, let me read just a few lines from the testimony and you will see whether the bureau feels they need any more funds. Director Klein said:

For example, five of our divisions started this last year special drives for exports in certain fields. In every instance there was an increase in our exports. As one example, take our automotive business, whose exports for the fiscal year 1924 exceeded those for the year 1923 by 49 per cent; the same was true in agricultural implements, which gained 61 per cent; industrial machinery 15 per cent; electric goods 24 per cent; lumber 28 per cent, and in every single instance there was

ample evidence that that gain was due largely to efforts made by those divisions specializing along these lines.

Just a few lines more:

It has been thought that our efforts are of particular significance to manufacture—to those dealing in fabricated products. As a matter of fact, however, the largest single groups of commodities now using the service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce are farm products—foodstuffs, cotton, and tobacco. These are the largest single beneficiaries of our service. That is to say, the demands or requests for help and services which we received from dealers and producers of farm products totaled 208,000 in the last fiscal year.

Then are enumerated the different special commodities that were inquired into. We can not sell if we do not have somebody there to furnish the information. They can not wait for six weeks to send a letter over here to some firm with which they are not acquainted and through which some indefinite information may be secured. Different trade terms are used in different countries. You can not write over to China and intelligently place an order. Not a man on the floor who is not engaged in foreign trade can write over there and intelligently place an order for something that is to come out of one of those exporting centers in China, because you are not able to give them a correct description of the goods you want to import. If an American can not place such order, how can the Chinaman place his order in America? There must be somebody there who is reliable and in whom they have confidence. Suppose you want to export apples even to London or to Berlin, where trade customs are similar to ours. What do you know about a possible purchaser over there—as to his reliability, as to the kind of apples you should offer him, or how to arrange for the transportation of the apples? All of those problems have to be met, and they have to be met by a personal representative. This matter is not provincial unless we make it provincial by trying to confine our trade and our efforts to the United States. The fact that our foreign trade has enormously increased does not mean that we are to stop expansion. Suppose England had done that years ago?

Why is she a great nation? It is not because of her raw products, and it is not because of her territory there at home, but it is because of her world trade, and that has always been the case. The prosperity and the expansion of that great nation has been built around her foreign commerce and around her merchant marine. We are trying to build up a merchant marine, and for the United States we want these agents to continue to build up our foreign trade so that our raw products and our manufactured products may be carried in American bottoms.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. It has been intimated that there is some conflict between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce in these matters. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I have heard some vague rumors about that, but I do not think there is anything serious along that line. The American farmer wants his products sold abroad regardless of whether he is helped to those sales through the Secretary of Agriculture or through the Secretary of Commerce. We have vast quantities of orchard products, of wheat products, of lumber, and fish in the Northwest, and the great expanding market is across the seas.

The volume of imports from Japan into the United States for 1923 amounted to \$347,000,000. Practically half this, or \$171,120,000, was imported through the ports of Seattle and Tacoma. Practically 80 per cent of imports from Japan, through the United States Pacific coast ports, is credited to these ports. Their foreign trade is rapidly increasing, and as our commerce with the Far East expands these great and growing cities of the Pacific Northwest will grow.

If we had proper representation there, instead of \$70,000,000 going out from the State of Washington to these foreign ports in the past nine months, there would be double that amount.

We who are intensely interested in agriculture have endeavored to secure legislative relief for the farmer. We were told our prices must be regulated by supply and demand. Every ambitious American farmer and manufacturer wants his farm or his factory to produce to the limit. This is right. Then we must neglect no opportunity to increase the foreign demand. Two hundred and eight thousand inquiries on farm products were handled by the Foreign Commerce Bureau last year. No opportunity for expansion should be neglected.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the House to the publication of the Paris protocol in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 21, 1925, and I would like to extend my remarks in the RECORD by having the text, without any comment, printed for the information of the Members of the House and the public. I ask that permission.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the Paris protocol. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the Paris protocol, taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 21, 1925, which is as follows:

PARIS, January 20.—The American diplomatic colony in Paris to-day was united in predicting that the loud noise the irreconcilables are making in the Senate will subside when the text of the Paris agreement for the essential section reached Washington. The official text was given out here to-night.

Far from pledging the United States to help the Allies enforce the reparation clauses of the treaty of Versailles, it is maintained that the Allies now recognize the Berlin treaty, and the United States signature rests upon nothing but a sort of annex to the Dawes plan, in which the American plans are accepted without even the scrutiny of the Reparations Commission or subject thereto in the future.

Col. James A. Logan, jr., American observer with the Reparations Commission and a member of the American delegation at the recent conference, has cabled Secretary Hughes a brief digest of the document, omitting the bulk of the 28 articles, which do not mention the United States and represent specific agreements among the Allies.

In no case can a phrase or paragraph be found entangling the United States in any obligation, Mr. Logan maintains.

The American claim, in his contention, rests on the basis of the Berlin treaty arrangements, whereas all other claims must pass through the Reparations Commission in accordance with the Versailles treaty.

A strong point in sustaining this argument is found in the text of the Dawes report, stating that the annuities payable by Germany on her reparations account, which had been worked out by the Dawes committee, "comprise all the amounts for which Germany may be liable to the Allies and associated powers for the costs arising out of the war, including reparations and restitution of all costs of all armies of occupation, clearing house operations, etc."

The official text of the Paris conference agreement given out here under the caption, "Agreement regarding distribution of the Dawes annuities," begins by saying, "The Governments of Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, United States of America, Brazil, Greece, Portugal, Rumania, the Serb-Croate-Slovene State, and Czechoslovakia, respectively, represented by the undersigned, have agreed as follows":

The statement comprises 5 chapters, 28 articles, and a protocol. Chapter I, article 1, deals with the costs of commissions which constitute a prior charge on the Dawes plan receipts. These include the Reparations Commission, an organization set up under the Dawes plan, with maximum expenses allowed of 9,500,000 gold marks a year, beginning September 1, 1924, and 7,500,000 gold marks in succeeding years.

Of these sums no more than 3,700,000 gold marks yearly shall be attributable to the organizations set up under the Dawes plan. If necessary, this sum can be increased to meet the costs of arbitral bodies provided under the Dawes plan London protocol.

ARMY COSTS TAKEN UP

Article 2 deals with the "Costs of armies of occupation during 1924 and 1925." Paragraph 1 deals with sums to be allowed prior charge payments by Germany during the year from September 1, 1924, to August 31, 1925, with respect to the costs of the armies of occupation of Belgium, Great Britain, and France, which shall be fixed at the following amounts: Belgian Army, 25,000,000 gold marks; British Army, 25,000,000 gold marks; French Army, 110,000,000 gold marks.

"B. Belgium, Great Britain, and France will meet their additional army costs during the period mentioned from their respective shares of the German reparations payments, but shall not be indebted to the reparations account. That is to say, their respective reparations arrears will increase by corresponding sums.

"C. Additional army costs shall be calculated as follows: Each power will be entitled to receive (1) sums payable under the finance ministers' agreement of March 11, 1922, calculated in the case of Great Britain on the basis of the French capitulation rate with special allowance of 2 gold marks per man converted on the sterling at the mean rates of exchange of respective currencies during December, 1921.

VALUE OF MARKS INCLUDED

"The value of German marks supplied armies of occupation and the value of any requisitions under article 6 of the Rhineland agree-

ment shall, as heretofore, be included in these sums; and (2) the value of requisitioned services under articles 8 to 12, inclusive, of the Rhineland agreement which are credited Germany in the accounts of the agent general of reparations. Each power's additional army costs shall be the difference between the total sums so calculated and the amount of the prior charge at the outset of paragraph 1 above.

"D. It is agreed that the powers concerned shall not charge for their effectives in excess of the strength authorized for each, respectively, by article 1, sections 2 and 3, of the agreement of March 11, 1922.

"E. The provisions of this article for the year to August 31, 1925, are accepted without prejudice to any question or principle and the Allied Governments and the Government of the United States will discuss before September 1, 1925, arrangements for the army costs in the future."

UNITED STATES SHARE

Article 3 of the "American article" of the Paris agreement, captioned "Share of the United States of America in the Dawes annuities" being: "(a) Out of the amount received from Germany on account of the Dawes annuities there shall be paid the United States of America the following sums in reimbursement of costs of the United States Army of Occupation and for the purpose of satisfying the wards of the Mixed Claims Commission established in pursuance of the agreement between the United States and Germany of August 10, 1922:

"(1) The sum of 55,000,000 gold marks per annum beginning September 1, 1926, continuing until the principal sums outstanding on account of the costs of the United States Army of Occupation, as already reported to the Reparations Commission, shall be extinguished.

"These annual payments constitute a first charge on the cash made available after transfer by the transfer committee out of the Dawes annuities after provision of sums necessary for service of the 8,000,000 gold marks German external loan of 1924, and for costs of the Reparations Commission, organizations established pursuant to the Dawes plan, Interallied Rhineland High Commission, the Military Control Commissions, and the payment to the Danube Commission, provided by article 9 below, and for any other prior charges, which may hereafter, with the assent of the United States of America, be admitted.

PROVIDES FOR ARREARS

"If in any year, the total sum of 55,000,000 gold marks be not transferred to the United States of America, arrears shall be carried forward to the next succeeding annual installment payment to the United States of America which shall be pro tanto increased. Arrears shall be cumulative and bear simple interest at 4½ per cent from the end of the year in which arrears accumulated until they are satisfied.

"(2) Two and a quarter per cent of all receipts from Germany on account of the Dawes annuities, available for distribution of sums allotted for other treaty charges by this agreement, provided that the annuity resulting from this percentage shall not in any year exceed the sum of 45,000,000 gold marks.

"(b) Subject to provisions of paragraph 1, above, the United States of America agrees: First, to waive any claims under Army cost agreement of May 25, 1923, on cash receipts obtained since January 1, 1923, beyond the sum of \$14,725,154.40, now deposited by Belgium in the blocked account in the Federal Reserve Bank, New York, which sum shall forthwith be released to the United States Treasury; second, that the agreement of May 25, 1923, does not apply to payments on account of reparations by any former enemy powers other than Germany; third, that the agreement of May 25, 1923, is deemed to be superseded by the present agreement.

PROVISIONS NOT TO BE ALTERED

"(c) The provisions of this agreement relating to admission against the Dawes annuities of charges other than reparations and allotments provided for such charges shall not be modified by allied governments so as to reduce the sums to be distributed as reparations save in agreement with the United States of America.

"(d) The United States of America is recognized as having an interest, proportionate to its 2¼ per cent interest in the part of annuities available for reparations, in any distribution of railway bonds, industrial debentures or other bonds issued under the Dawes plan, or in the proceeds of any sale of undistributed bonds or debentures, and as having the right also to share in respect to the repayment of its Army costs as provided in the present agreement. The United States of America is also recognized as having an interest in any other disposition that may be made of bonds if not sold or distributed."

Chapter II, article 4, is entitled "The Belgian War Debt," and includes the following terms:

"A. As from September 1, 1924, 5 per cent of the total sum available in any year after meeting the charges for the service of the German external loan of 1924, and the charges and costs of the commissions; the cost of the United States Army of Occupation; the annuity arrears from May, 1921, on the Army costs; the prior charge for current Army costs;

and other prior charges which may hereafter be agreed, shall be applied to the reimbursement of the Belgian war debt as defined in the last paragraph of article 232 of the treaty of Versailles.

PROPORTIONATE DISTRIBUTION

"B. The amounts so applied in any year shall be distributed among the powers concerned in the proportion of the amount of the debt due them, respectively, as at May 1, 1921. Pending a final settlement of the accounts, France will receive 46 per cent; Great Britain, 42 per cent; Belgium (by reason of her debt to the United States), 12 per cent."

Article 5 deals with "Restitution," allotting 1 per cent annually for the first four years to these allied claims, after all the priorities are met, including the service of the German loan, the costs of the commissions, and the United States Army costs, among the others. During subsequent years 1 per cent of the first 1,000,000,000 gold marks, after meeting the priority charges, and 2 per cent of the surplus of the annuity is allotted.

BELGIAN PRIORITY

Article 6 deals with the Belgian priority, allocating to Belgium from the annuities received from Germany after September 1, 8 per cent a year, beginning September 1, 1924, and the same per cent monthly during the following year until the priority is extinguished, when the percentage of all further payments of that year will be reduced to 4½ per cent. During the year commencing September 1, 1926, and each succeeding, Belgium's percentage will be 4½ per cent. This reduction was accepted as fully discharging Belgium from obligations to repay her priority. The article continues:

"As from the date at which the Belgian priority is extinguished, at the latest September 1, 1926, the 3½ per cent released by the above arrangements for the repayment of the Belgian priority will be payable to France and Great Britain in proportion to 52-22, in addition to the Spa percentages."

Article 7 deals with the Greek and Rumanian percentages, fixing that of Greece at four-tenths per cent of the German payments, and Rumania at 1½ per cent.

Article 8 deals with miscellaneous allied claims, which will be submitted for evaluation by the Reparations Commission.

Article 9 provides compensation for the European Danube Commission.

CLEARING OFFICE BALANCES

Article 10 is entitled "Clearing Office Balances," and provides that no special charge shall be admitted against the Dawes annuities in respect to clearing office balances of pre-war debts or other claims under the economic clauses of the treaty, unless it is shown that any allied power claiming benefit from such charge has a net credit balance due for payment, after applying, to meet its claims under the economic clauses, German properties and other assets, which it is in its power to liquidate under the same article. No provision shall be made for such net credit balances during the first four years of the Dawes plan.

Article 11 deals with the request of the allied governments that the Reparations Commission draw up as soon as possible a definite distribution of the accounts up to September 21, 1924, when the Dawes plan began operation, and gives authority to the respective delegates on the commission to submit to arbitration questions on which the agreement is not unanimous.

RECEIPTS OBTAINED

Article 12 deals exclusively with the receipts obtained by the French, Belgian, and Italian Governments from the occupation of the Ruhr, delegating the Reparations Commission to draw up the accounts of both deliveries in kind and in cash, taking into account the army costs and other administrative expenses, and debiting the respective allies against the reparations. The article adds:

"The balance account shall, with the exception of the sum mentioned in subparagraph 1 of paragraph B under article 3 be paid over to the Belgian Government, which shall be debited on the account of its priority for the period before September 1, 1924, with the full amount so received, less the interest due on the German treasury bills transferred to Belgium in 1922."

Another paragraph continues:

"In accordance with annex 3 of the London protocol, no claim will be made for payment from the Dawes annuities for any costs with respect to the military forces in German territory not occupied January 1, 1923, other than the value of the requisitions effected by or services rendered to these forces after September 1, 1924. The value of such requisitions or services will be accounted as deliveries on the reparations account to the allied powers concerned."

CHAPTER 3 NEXT

Chapter 3, articles 13 to 17, inclusive, deal with "questions arising out of previous agreements" between the Allies, such as the appropriation of deliveries in kind to the costs of the armies of occupation; the retention by each power of deliveries in kind received by it; the costs of the armies of occupation for the period from May 1 to August 1, 1924; the debit vessels allotted or transferred to Belgium under article 6, section 4 of the Spa protocol, and the debit on Japan's reparation percentage for the Shantung railways and mines.

Chapter 4, article 18, entitled "Interest account," provides for the waiving of all interest charges between the allied powers on reparation receipts up to September 1, 1924, and fixes the interest thereafter at 5 per cent on the excess receipts due as from September 1, 1924, by any allied power to the reparations pool.

Article 19, on "Excesses and arrears," directs the Reparations Commission to draw up accounts as of September 1, 1924, of each power entitled to share in reparations payments from Germany, "but not including the United States of America." These accounts are directed to include the balance of the receipts actually credited as against the Spa percentages.

RECOVERY OF ARREARS

Article 20 deals with the "recovery of arrears," stipulating that the excess payments had by any power as fixed by the Reparations Commission at the end of each year shall be repaid by the reduction of certain percentages from the shares of that power in each succeeding annuity until the debt is paid off, and interest at the rate of 5 per cent.

Article 21, entitled "Costs of armies of occupation to May 1, 1921," provides that "the arrears due France and Great Britain on account before May 1, 1921, shall be excluded from the general account of arrears and discharged by a special allotment from the Dawes annuities (ranking immediately after the charge in favor of the United States Army costs) of the following amounts: During the first year 15,000,000 gold marks; second year 20,000,000 gold marks; third, 25,000,000 gold marks; fourth year, 30,000,000 gold marks, and thereafter an annuity of 30,000,000 gold marks until the arrears are extinguished. This allotment shall be divided between France and Great Britain in the proportion of France 57 per cent and Great Britain 43 per cent."

CHAPTER 5, "MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS"

Article 22 fixes the "expense account" of the sum due by Czechoslovakia to the Reparations Commission with respect to deliveries in kind received from Germany and Hungary since May 1, 1921.

Article 23 deals with the division among the Allies of the Bulgarian reparations payments under the Sofia protocol.

Article 24 gives the allied representatives on the Reparations Commission power to settle all questions concerned with the property ceded by the free city of Danzig.

Article 25 is entitled "Recommendations with regard to the distribution of payments throughout the year," the full text of which follows:

"The finance ministers drew the attention of the Reparations Commission to the fact that the operation of the Dawes plan would be greatly facilitated if the agent general for reparations payments could so arrange that the annual payments to be made during the operation of the Dawes plan may be distributed throughout the course of each year, and they request the Reparations Commission and agent general to consider what steps can be taken to secure this result, which is of particular importance during the second and third years of the plan."

"With a view to accomplishing this result, the allied governments, so far as they are concerned, authorize the Reparations Commission and the agent general to cooperate with the trustees for the railway bonds and industrial debentures to take all action which may be necessary to arrange that the due dates for the payments be made on the railway and industrial bonds, so as to provide for a gradual and even flow of payments throughout each annuity year. Furthermore, the finance ministers authorize the Reparations Commission to make arrangements as far as may be practicable without prejudicing the requirements of other powers to enable the Portuguese Government to obtain during the second year of the Dawes plan the sums necessary to complete certain outstanding orders for deliveries in kind of special importance to it."

INTERPRETATION ARTICLE

Article 26, captioned "Interpretation," follows in full:

"This agreement shall be transmitted to the Reparations Commission; the commission will be requested to give effect thereto and adjust all payments during the remainder of the year to August 31, 1925, and during the subsequent years, so that the total receipts of each allied power during each year shall not exceed its share under this agreement. The Reparations Commission shall have the authority by a unanimous resolution to interpret the provisions of the agreement in so far as the allied powers are concerned. If any differences or dispute shall arise on the Reparations Commission or between the allied powers in respect to the interpretation of any provision of this agreement or as to anything to be done hereunder, whether by the commission or otherwise, the same shall be referred to arbitration by a single arbitrator to be agreed upon unanimously by the commission, or failing agreement to be appointed by the president for the time being of the Permanent Court of International Justice."

"Any differences or dispute that may arise with the United States of America regarding the interpretation of this agreement affecting American claims or the rights of the United States of America under this agreement shall be referred to an arbitrator to be agreed upon

between the United States of America and the Reparations Commission acting unanimously."

Article 27 declares that the "provisions of the present arrangement concluded between the powers interested in reparations do not prejudice any rights or obligations of Germany under the treaties, conventions, or arrangements at present in force."

Article 26 declares "The present arrangement, done in English and French in a single copy, will be deposited in the archives of the French Republic, which will supply certified copies thereof to each of the signatory powers. The interpretation of this agreement in the English and French texts shall both be authentic."

The brief of the protocol attests the fact that the present arrangement was signed by all the powers concerned.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BEEDY].

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I think no one is more interested in the extension of American trade than myself, and surely no one appreciates the valuable services which our commercial attachés have rendered since legislation provided for them in Europe. It so happens that in the summer of 1923, in my visit to 10 different countries, I took occasion to visit the offices of these commercial attachés to see what they were doing; it so happens also that a member of my family recently made a survey of the wood-pulp industries of Europe, and had occasion to consult the commercial attachés frequently. My experience with this department would not lead me to minimize the value of the services which it has rendered and is now rendering.

I want to call to the attention of the House, however, this fact, which it seems to me we are losing sight of for the moment. When the first suggestions were offered that we establish these attachés and make appropriations for them there were those, thoughtful men and well informed, who said, "You are providing for a duplication of the very services which your consular offices are rendering this country and we are opposed to it." The first provision in this direction was acknowledged to be purely experimental. I am not in favor of attempting to go too fast in what I am convinced, in a very appreciable manner, is a duplication of the services rendered by the consular agents.

I am certainly opposed to increasing the appropriation for commercial attachés over that allowed in this bill unless the Secretary of Commerce himself wants to come before the committee and tell us that there is a necessity for such an increase. I prefer to stand with the President in this matter, who, I understand, believes, upon consultation and investigation, that \$315,000 is sufficient to promote the best interests of our trade abroad through our commercial attachés, and I want the House to recollect also that in addition to this \$315,000 provided for commercial attachés this bill carries \$430,000 for the extension of American trade in Europe and in other parts of the world.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This \$315,000 includes not only commercial attachés but the greater part of it includes trade commissioners and aid to export industries.

Mr. BEEDY. Exactly.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And only a fraction of it applies to the commercial attachés.

Mr. BEEDY. That is true. In referring to commercial attachés I mean to include the trade commissioners who are in the same branch of service and simply are outranked by the commercial attachés.

Mr. HUDSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Certainly.

Mr. HUDSON. Was the request of the department cut by the Budget Bureau in this instance for this purpose?

Mr. BEEDY. This bill allows \$140,000 more than the Director of the Budget recommended.

Mr. HUDSON. I mean for this particular purpose.

Mr. BEEDY. For this particular purpose \$10,000 more is appropriated, I am informed, than the Director of the Budget recommended.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I beg to differ with the gentleman. It allows \$4,000 more than was recommended by the Budget. The bill allows \$80,000 more than the current appropriation.

Mr. BEEDY. If the gentleman will pardon me, I repeat that investigation will reveal the fact that the present bill carries \$140,000 more than was appropriated for the current year.

A question was just asked here, and it has not been answered. The gentleman from New York asked whether we had any commercial attachés in China; and if so, where? We have a trade commissioner at Canton, we have a trade commissioner at

Shanghai, and a trade commissioner and a commercial attaché at Peking.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman from Maine give way?

Mr. BEEDY. Certainly.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. For the benefit of some of us, will the gentleman explain the difference between a commercial attaché and a trade commissioner? I do not think all of us have that distinction in mind.

Mr. BEEDY. There is the same difference as there would be between an ambassador, we will say, and the first assistant in the embassy. The one outranks the other and draws more salary, but they are both employed in the same kind of work. That is my understanding of it.

In addition to these trade commissioners and the commercial attachés which we already have in China—and I allude to this because we all appreciate the importance of developing our trade in the East—we have our consular agents; and I want to say that in the making of this survey of the wood-pulp industries of Europe we were able to get quite as much information from our consular agents as we were from these commercial attachés.

There is a duplication of work here. There is no question about it, and this appropriation of \$315,000 was made because we appreciated the importance of extended activity in the development of American trade.

I think the sound and proper thing for us to do is to follow the recommendations of this committee and not go too fast in the spending of money in this particular connection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, so far the discussion has been directed to the first amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] which has to do with the increase in the number of foreign attachés, but that amendment has been followed by others, and it is fair to say that the adoption of these several amendments will effect one general result. It will invigorate the work and increase the usefulness of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Questions have been asked as to what that bureau is doing. Anyone who reads the very valuable weekly publication that is issued by the bureau, entitled "Commerce Reports," will have no difficulty in getting an answer to several of the questions that have been propounded. The editor of that publication is Doctor Klein, who has testified before the Committee on Appropriations.

Something was said a while ago by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] about the efforts to increase the appropriations, and he spoke of propaganda and propagandists. I myself have not been appealed to by people who can be put in that category. I rely very largely on the opinion of a man whose opinion on such subjects as this in my judgment is entitled to more weight than any opinion that I can possibly entertain or express or the opinion that may be entertained by most men in public life. I refer to the Secretary of Commerce himself. There is no man who has a fuller appreciation of the whole field of American foreign commerce and its needs than Mr. Hoover, and, albeit, he supports, as we all support, a general policy of economy, he does not hesitate for a moment to say that it is greatly to the interest of the country that the bureau shall be stimulated by additional appropriations.

Something has been said about duplication of efforts. There is practically no duplication, as far as the Department of Commerce and the Department of State are concerned. So far as the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture are concerned, there may be a slight but not a serious duplication. It has been suggested that this is perhaps a covert effort to weaken the Department of Agriculture. I think I am in as good position as anyone as a member of the joint committee on reorganization to say that there is no foundation for any such view. The Bureau of Markets and the Bureau of Economics are going to be maintained in the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is going to be maintained in the Department of Commerce. The Agriculture Department has to do very largely with the extremely important matter of considering domestic markets and assisting the agricultural producers of the country to find domestic markets.

The primary business of the Department of Commerce, exerting its powers through the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, is to find channels through which Ameri-

can trade can pass to foreign countries and the bureau has done a tremendous work in that direction, during the time that I have served in this body. It has been of infinite value. It has been of infinite value to our manufacturers and likewise to our agricultural producers. We have spent weeks and months here discussing what we may do to solve what we speak of as the agricultural problem. Specifics have been proposed which some have thought of as panaceas. Where are they? They have vanished. There is not a single bill, so far as I know, before Congress that anyone believes in, in a broad way, in a comprehensive manner, will materially better the position of agriculture.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. What about the Ketcham bill?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I do not know as to that bill, but it has not received much consideration so far as I am informed.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. It has been considered right on the floor of the House here.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I am even ignorant of that. I am willing the gentleman shall state the purpose of that bill.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. The Ketcham bill has to do with the increasing of the ratings of the employees sent out, the representatives of agriculture, to the different governments. It has been shown by the Secretary of Agriculture that they have been of great influence in broadening the domain for our market supplies. As far as our own dairy products are concerned, that is true.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes; but even so, the passage of that bill would not in any way afford a general solution of the agricultural problem. There was here in the last days of the last session the bill introduced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Hoch] with reference to freight rates, for which great things were predicted. No final action has been taken on that. And the same observation applies to other bills that might be mentioned. There is now an agricultural commission functioning. Is there anybody who is so confident, I may say so credulous, as to believe that the commission is going to recommend any measure which will advance us very far in doing what is the common desire? I am now only talking about the difficulty of providing any general effective remedy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer to what Doctor Klein said to the committee to show that we are not dealing with a visionary thing, a conjectural or theoretical thing, but with a very practical matter. Doctor Klein told the committee that the bureau can not function to the advantage of the public unless the appropriations are increased, and he proceeded to mention several agricultural products as to which he is endeavoring to furnish information to the producers and exporters; but he said that the work was so far behind that the bureau is greatly embarrassed. He spoke of tobacco; he spoke of foodstuffs. He spoke of the desire of American producers, mentioning the State of Tennessee, to obtain timely information with reference to foreign markets for poultry products.

Mr. BEEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would but I have not the time. He spoke of the same fact with reference to export lumber. He spoke of the same fact in reference to producers of citrus fruits seeking foreign markets. He mentioned in the same connection the very urgent importance of giving information without delay, without months of delay, when the information will be of little or no value to manufacturers of boots and shoes and machinery and the other output of American factories. He showed how desirable it is that exporters may be advised and quickly advised of changes in foreign tariff duties and changes in ocean freight rates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I think, gentlemen, if we are really interested in agriculture, as we claim to be, as well as in our manufacturing industries, that we should support the pending amendments. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, if the point of order were made to most of these items contained in the paragraphs to which the four amendments now being debated will be offered, they would go out of the bill, because there is no organic law

authorizing them. They appear in this appropriation bill without legislative authority.

This little bureau has been growing and growing and growing and spreading its wings until they can hardly house it. It is not the Department of Commerce; it is merely one of its many bureaus. Let me show what we are spending for this one little bureau—the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—as already given to it for the coming fiscal year by the committee in this bill. We give the director, in the very first paragraph, \$266,477, without any restrictions whatever. We do not even direct or confine him as to how he is to expend it. We give him that huge lump-sum appropriation and start him off with it, and then we give him the following additional amounts: Commercial attachés, \$315,861; promoting commerce, Europe and other areas, we give him \$432,600 more; district and cooperative office service, we give him \$230,818 more; promoting commerce, South and Central America, we give him \$248,040 more; promoting commerce in the Far East, we give him \$243,734 more; enforcement of China trade act, we give him \$30,000 more; export industries, we give him \$618,054 more; domestic commerce and raw materials investigation, we give him \$115,000 more; transportation and interment of remains of officers and employees of the bureau, we give him \$1,500 more; transportation of families and effects of officers and employees, \$35,000 more; customs statistics, \$330,930 more; lists of foreign buyers, \$12,000 more; investigation of foreign trade restriction, \$30,000, and so on.

This is entirely too much money to give this one little bureau. Not long ago all the bureaus in the department did not spend that much.

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. How much is it, all together?

Mr. BLANTON. I am going to add it up, but I need an adding machine to do it. It aggregates the tremendous sum of \$2,919,064 for this one little bureau alone, and still they are asking to enlarge it.

I am in favor of commercial attachés, upon a sane and reasonable basis, and I was following the gentleman from Tennessee until he showed me how much they were costing apiece. I imagined \$75,000 would give quite a number of additional ones; but when he told me from the floor specifically that I had understood him correctly, that the \$75,000 additional he was trying to add to this paragraph would only furnish us three more of them, I concluded that they came too high. Twenty-five thousand dollars apiece for commercial attachés is too costly, and that telegram from these export manufacturers and a copy of which was read from New York did not have the desired effect on me when I found out how much they were costing.

When is this money spending going to stop? In the year 1913 you created this bureau not by legislative act but by an unauthorized rider on an appropriation bill. You consolidated the little Bureau of Manufacturers with the little Bureau of Statistics and added certain other services taken from the Department of Labor, and started this otherwise unauthorized bureau carried in this bill, and it has been growing and growing and growing for 12 years. Mr. Secretary Hoover is continually enlarging most of the bureaus of his department and is duplicating work done by many other departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. And you will find, if you will just figure it up, what a tremendous sum the various bureaus in his department are costing now, and you will stay by the Budget, I believe. I am going to stay with the Budget on this proposition and vote against all of the increases proposed in the four amendments.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as I see it there is a difference in judgment between members of the Committee on Appropriations as to the amount of money that can be used to advantage by a very efficient bureau of the Government during this next fiscal year. It has been my experience as a Member of Congress that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is one of the most efficient bureaus of the Government that we have. In our committee work there has repeatedly come to my attention instances of the great value of the work of that bureau to our export trade in agriculture and manufactures. This difference of opinion arises. The opponents of an increase claim that no officer or employee of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce or of the Department of Commerce has appeared before the committee and requested any amount of money in excess of the Budget estimates. Well, of course, there is a very good reason for their not doing so. Under the Budget act Congress prohibited anything of that kind. That law was so drafted as to prevent

Congress receiving an honest and frank expression from a departmental head or a bureau chief as to whether or not the Budget has treated them fairly in submitting their estimate. Here is the provision of the Budget law:

No estimate or request for appropriation, and no request for an increase in an item of any such estimate or request, and no recommendation as to how the revenue needs of the Government should be met, shall be submitted to Congress or any committee thereof by an officer or employee, of any department or establishment, unless at the request of either House of Congress.

Not a committee of Congress, but at the request of either House of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that in an effort to ascertain the real needs of the Department of Labor in regard to immigration the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman brought the heads of the Department of Labor to our committee and made proper inquiry and were met with the very statement that the gentleman gives, that they did not dare come before any committee of Congress even in order for it to find out their demands and find out what was going on.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes; and along the line of the gentleman's suggestion; a year ago, because of the failure of the Budget to adequately provide for the Immigration Service, this House added \$1,200,000 for an immigration border patrol. As a result this year an adequate provision is included in the estimate from the Budget Bureau. If the House had not acted then, where would we have been with reference to the border patrol and the prevention of the bootlegging of immigrants?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But the departmental representatives were afraid to speak before a committee which sent for them; not an appropriating committee at all but a legislative committee. They said they were prohibited from recommending anything more than the Budget Bureau had estimated for.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether or not it is true that officials of the Department of Commerce have been running around soliciting Congressmen themselves, and whether they did not go before the gentleman's committee and practically evade that provision?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I do not know as to that; but I will say this, that if there are any persons in the country that ought to have an expression of the frank judgment of the department people, it is the Representatives of the people, who are voting the money?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if that is not true?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, I think I had better advise the gentleman privately about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes additional?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in the hearings that we have here, in the testimony of Director Klein, while you will not find any specific request for increase, yet in the statement made by the Secretary of Commerce, giving his view on the question of trade competition during the next fiscal year and the necessity of increasing the appropriation in order to meet it, his opinion is expressed. Gentleman, that is just as far under the law as the Secretary or a bureau chief could go.

As to the money that has been expended, if you will refer to the hearings you will find where there has been an increase of American business amounting to \$529,000,000, made possible by the work of this bureau, at an expenditure that same year of \$2,600,000, and that is 15,000 per cent on the investment. It strikes me that is a pretty good sort of work to continue and to provide with an adequate force.

It is estimated that this additional business brought into the Treasury of the United States \$7,000,000, as against an appropriation of \$2,600,000, which is about 300 per cent increase upon the investment, in money going into the Treasury.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. What means have you of knowing how much additional money has been brought into the country through this instrumentality and how much additional revenue has been brought into the Treasury?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. If the gentleman will refer to the hearings, he will find that question propounded by a member of the committee as to the increase of this business and the contracts obtained. In the answer Doctor Klein proceeded to detail facts giving the names and amounts of contracts. The total as given was \$529,000,000.

Gentlemen, I shall support the motion for the increase. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE].

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question, which is directly in point with the statement made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON]. Is it not true that representatives of the Department of Commerce have been soliciting different Members of Congress for increased appropriations along this line, completely evading the law referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON], which expressly prohibits it?

Mr. SHREVE. I do not know as to "representatives" of the department, but I understand that one representative of the Department of Commerce has been soliciting votes for the BYRNS amendment.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Could the gentleman state his name for the Record?

Mr. SHREVE. I would not care to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman from New York want him to be separated from the department?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Well, if he has done that he deserves to be separated from the department.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is not willing to give the information.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will not be affected or influenced in their consideration of the merits of the amendment by the controversy that has occurred among these gentlemen as to whether or not the amendment has been advocated by some officials of the department. The question is whether we shall continue to go on upbuilding our commerce and maintain it to the fullest extent, in order to be of real practical value to the entire country. The question as to these commercial agencies and the extension of our foreign trade and commerce is one that, while peculiarly of primary benefit to the manufacturing interests and exporting interests of the country, is yet such that a man would be shortsighted if he did not realize that the agricultural interests and every other active industrial interest of this country has a selfish stake in it. I live in the inland. The district that I have the honor to represent is in the heart of the Nation; and yet I know that the people of my district will be benefited in the future, not, perhaps, directly, by our foreign commerce, although I know that our principal product has to find a foreign market for 65 per cent of that product. But when you develop all the interests of this Nation and find a foreign market for the surplus of our factories and farms and mines and all our industrial activities, you increase the welfare of the entire American people and their means of living; you add to the standard of living of the people of this Nation.

The man who has not sensed the future is very short-sighted, because the future contains the real conflict, the real battle that is to be fought; and that is the battle of economic competition in the markets of the world. It would be a short-sighted policy for this Nation, with its wonderful natural resources, with its great wealth, if it did not use every legitimate means at hand to force the products of our farms and factories into the markets of the earth, and bring the benefits that accrue to all the homes of the Nation. Therefore, I shall support an amendment that will give the greatest amount of possible efficiency and activity to these agencies that are carrying on this good work. [Applause.]

Just a word in closing. Some of my friends think they have discovered a mare's nest because somebody in the Department of Commerce has seen fit to furnish Congress or Members of Congress with information. Gentlemen, you have a mistaken idea about the Budget.

The original purpose of the Bureau of the Budget was to require a more practical estimate and request upon the Congress

for public funds to maintain the executive departments, but now gentlemen wish to interpret it on the theory that Members of Congress have not the intelligence or the capacity to discharge the time-honored function of a representative body—that is, to control the purse strings—and the theory now is that you must go out and brand as a felon any man who either by request of a Member of Congress or by reason of his interest in the public welfare volunteers information to a Member of Congress. That is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. I do not like the suggestion that Members of Congress be put off in this box and that you must not permit any information to get to us except through one little channel, or that we must swallow what the Lord of the Budget sticks down our mouths, whether it be wise or unwise. In other words, gentlemen, I fight and shall continue to fight for the keystone of Anglo-Saxon government, and that is that the people's representatives shall control the purse strings. I maintain that as Members of Congress we not only have that right but that we have the intelligence, more than any other agency of the Government, to determine how the funds of the people shall be disbursed and for what purposes. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota). The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. McDUFFIE].

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think every Member of Congress really has an earnest desire to economize in the expenditure of public money. I think there are some things about the Budget that work for the good of the country, but the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] is correct in saying that the Congress itself is supposed to determine the amount of Federal funds to be expended in any wise. Yet it does seem the day is rapidly coming, if it is not already here, when the people's representatives must sit here and not make certain appropriations; because, forsooth, some one man says, "This interferes with the program of the Director of the Budget and you can not pass this legislation."

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDUFFIE. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. There is more carried in this bill for this service than was recommended by the Budget—a good deal more.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Not a good deal more; only about \$79,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I think the gentleman will find it is not a great deal more if he will examine the figures. At the same time, it is not as much as the Department of Commerce, for whom we are supposed to legislate to-day, desires. I think the gentleman will not dispute that.

Mr. MADDEN. They did not say so to us.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Because of certain proprieties probably they dared not say so. I happen to be one of those who did not receive one of the telegrams we have heard read; nor have I seen any member of the official personnel of the Department of Commerce with reference to this matter. I am, however, one of those who believe, gentlemen, that if we hope to progress and fully develop our commerce across the seas—and we must do that—we should provide ample means with which to furnish necessary information to our manufacturers and producers who need a foreign market for their goods. If other great nations do this, surely we can not do otherwise.

We have a great merchant marine. We have done well with a great big problem of putting our flag on the seas, the most stupendous undertaking of the Government in many years. We must maintain our merchant marine; that can not be disputed. How are you going to have the tonnage for our ships and compete for our share of the world's business unless we have the necessary agencies that other great nations have to go and get the business? Some one has suggested that we are doing well enough, and we should "let well enough alone." That is the substance of what has been said on this floor—that we already have a balance of trade in our favor amounting to \$1,000,000,000 and that is sufficient. But that is not the course this great Government should pursue if we are to take our proper place as a great commercial nation. Other big nations do not pursue such a course. If we are to be able to furnish tonnage for our ships that will, I hope, continue to sail from our ports to the seven seas, it is necessary, as you know, that we develop that tonnage for our vessels. Now, if you are going to say that just because we have a balance of trade amounting to \$1,000,000,000 we must stop there, why, then you are absolutely correct in failing to provide sufficient funds with which our foreign trade might be substantially increased. Gentlemen, let me warn you that is not the policy of the nations that get

the business of the world. I do not know how much more they spend than we do in this way. I have tried to find out and compare what England, Germany, and Japan do along this line, and I dare say that all the big nations of the world have better-paid representatives in the fields of business throughout the world than this great country of ours.

I have taken up your time to-day for a few moments, not because somebody has propagandized me—and, may I say, I have no objection to that. The right of appeal to the representatives of the people is proper and perfectly legitimate. I am advocating the amendments not because some man in the department down there has urged me to do so but because I really believe if this Nation is to handle its fair share of the business of the world it is necessary to go out and get that business. We can not get that business unless we provide the necessary funds for that purpose.

Now, let me call your attention to the hearings, which are very interesting. On page 14 there are many, many instances cited where American business concerns were greatly benefited by the work of this bureau. On page 50 the chairman of the subcommittee referred to the lists of foreign buyers and the witness, Doctor Klein, said:

There is an increase of \$2,700. That, perhaps, is the first and most direct service we now render to exporters. The first question which we get from any business man who has become interested in export is "Can you give me the name of a good agent for my commodity in a certain market abroad?" and we have been completely swamped with requests for lists of that description. In 1921-22 we had a call for 69,000 lists of that sort—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for just one minute more.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. McDUFFIE (reading)—

the next year 178,000, this last fiscal year 416,000—in other words, six times as many last year as we had two years ago, and these lists were not handed out broadcast, but they were requested in each case individually.

I read this simply to point out the great value of this activity of the bureau, the calls made upon it, and the volume of business which is possible to be obtained, provided we furnish sufficient funds. In my judgment the committee should adopt the Byrns amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk, read at this time for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: On page 55, line 5, after the word "industries," strike out "\$115,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000," and add the following: "Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used for collecting and compiling information regarding the disposition and handling or to investigate the conditions of production and marketing of raw agricultural products in the United States, or in foreign countries."

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, there are two phases of this question I want to discuss. The first one is that there is and has been a tendency on the part of the Department of Commerce to duplicate and infringe upon the duties of the Department of Agriculture. The second one is that it is my belief the United States is becoming the sales agent for the export concerns of this country to an extent that is unwarranted in the business development of the export trade of this country.

On the first proposition the conflict between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce came up when a very innocent amendment was put in, I think two years ago, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], when they increased the allowance to investigate crude rubber, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] in his statement said he thought it might be a good thing to also include nitrates. Secretary Hoover, when before the committee, said he thought it would be a good thing to include coconut oil, but lo and behold, when that item came out in the bill it gave the Department of Commerce authority to investigate all agricultural products. Then they increased their personnel and went out into the field and duplicated the work of the Department

of Agriculture, and I am going to call your attention to a few instances of that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will state, will he not, for the benefit of the committee, that that was not out of any of these appropriations but out of a special appropriation of \$50,000?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes; but it is included in this appropriation now by the committee joining the two sums, \$50,000 of which is for this purpose.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That does not come under any item I have offered an amendment to.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. That is shown by the report of the committee, and the item I refer to is in the consolidation of the two items.

Here is a report of the Department of Commerce, dated January, 1925, and it is entitled "International Trade in Wool." Every single, solitary bit of information that is in this book is old and obsolete, and the real wool producers of this country get their information from the weekly and the monthly bulletins sent out by the Department of Agriculture. There is nothing in this publication that will assist them in any way in selling or handling wool, and in order that you may know of this duplication, I want to give you these references. Here is "International trade in wool," Agricultural Yearbook, Department of Agriculture, 1923, page 290. "World wool production," exactly the same thing, and "Wool trade in agricultural production," Department of Commerce Bulletin No. 13, page 2. Take them and examine them and you will find they absolutely cover the same statement of facts.

"World distribution of sheep," Yearbook of Agriculture, 1923, page 232; "Sheep raising," Bulletin No. 13, Department of Commerce, page 4.

"Types of sheep"—tell me who there is down in the Department of Commerce who knows anything about the types of sheep; not one of them; and yet here are "Types of sheep" dealt with in the Yearbook of 1923, at page 240, and "Types of breeds" are discussed in the Department of Commerce Bulletin No. 13, page 6, with just a change in the heading.

"Development of the sheep industry," Yearbook of 1923, page 234. "Westward trend of sheep raising in different sections of the United States," Bulletin of the Department of Commerce No. 13, page 9.

"Grades of wool and their uses," Yearbook of Agriculture, 1923, page 297. "Classification of wool imports," Bulletin No. 13, page 4. This contains an absolute duplication of every bit of information that is contained in the article of the Department of Agriculture.

The reason I am bringing in this amendment is to follow out the course we tried to make plain in this House last winter when we defeated the Winslow bill. This is only a continuation of that fight.

Under this crude-rubber appropriation the Department of Commerce increased its personnel for the investigation of these agricultural commodities; and if they do not get these increases, they will have to contract that personnel because of the fact they have had a group of men working on this information which involved agricultural products, a field they ought never to have entered and a field they knew the Department of Commerce was never organized to enter. [Applause.] And yet you men here are absolutely working into their hands by increasing these amounts and the personnel so that they can go along and do the very things which I suggest they have been doing; and not only that but I do not know how many departments of this Government the Department of Commerce ought to run.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Going from wool to cattle, does not the gentleman think we ought to adopt the Byrns amendment, so we can build up the export trade and relieve the cattlemen of the West, who are to-day absolutely broke because they have no market in this country for their meat?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. If there is any information that the Department of Commerce can get for you in the world markets to-day, even if you increase their personnel, it is already available for you down in the Department of Agriculture, in the Bureau of Economics. [Applause.]

Mr. HUDSPETH. If the gentleman will permit, I understand the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is to increase the force abroad so that they can encourage and promote the foreign market.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. And I am explaining to you that you can increase the appropriation all you wish; but if the

information is not available for you, they can not get it for you. No representative of any department of the Government can make a market where one does not exist.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I think the gentleman will agree with me, and with his cheer leader from New York also, that we have not a market for our meats in this country to-day.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I will agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And the cattlemen of this country are going broke by the thousands all over the country, and everybody knows it.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. You are talking from the cattle end of it; let me talk to you from the market end of it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am talking about the end of it that I know something about and am interested in; and that is why I am interested in the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Let me say to the gentleman that if that market is not available to you through the Department of Agriculture, neither is it available through the Department of Commerce, and your cattle situation is not going to be helped any if you increase the amount for this purpose five times the amount suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is not the great trouble with our cattlemen and our sheepmen—

Mr. HUDSPETH. There is not any trouble with the sheepmen.

Mr. BLANTON. Due to the fact that the packers are shipping into this country, and have been for years, millions of pounds of frozen meat from other countries in competition with our American-raised meat?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Some frozen meat is coming into this country.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Did the gentleman vote for a tariff of 40 per cent on meat?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes. I wanted to stop it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. But you did not stop it.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I do not want the Texas delegation to monopolize my time.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Has the Department of Agriculture any representatives abroad in the places where the gentleman's amendment proposes to establish commercial attachés?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. They have at least four of them for every man that they have got in the Department of Commerce. They are collecting information from every country in the world.

Mr. MILLS. Is the gentleman in a position to tell us how many representatives of the Department of Agriculture are in Europe to-day, for instance?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I have the information here, and I will insert it in the Record.

Mr. MILLS. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I can not give it to the gentleman offhand.

Mr. MILLS. Could the gentleman give it to us before this matter comes to a vote?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I think I can. I suggest this one thing further. I do not want this country to become the granddaddy for every exporting concern there is in the country, and that is what you are attempting to do here. Our Government is getting Hooverized sufficiently. [Applause.] There is hardly a morning paper that comes out but carries a headline of some kind that Mr. Hoover is going to do this, that, or the other thing. He is going to tell us how to regulate the traffic in the District of Columbia; he is going to tell the farmers how to save waste—

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. No; I can not yield any more.

The farmer has to be Hooverized, if you please, by being told how to prevent waste, and he is going to tell the cattlemen how, if they will prevent waste they will be all right, and therefore do not need legislative assistance. We are even going to have a Secretary of Agriculture, if you please, who is approved by Secretary Hoover of the Department of Commerce, when, as a matter of fact, you gentlemen all know that ever since Mr. Hoover has had charge of the Department of Commerce he has been trying to work into the Department of Agriculture, to take its bureaus' functions, in so far as he could get legislation to do so, and last year we defeated the

attempt in the Winslow bill; and here now is an effort to bring about this change without legislation by an increase in personnel, on the theory that they have enough authority if they can get the personnel. [Applause.]

It may be assumed from the testimony before the committee that the information given out by the Department of Commerce is of especial benefit to the producers of agricultural raw products. In view of the fact that it is shown that 208,000 inquiries were received in 1923 and 1924 from exporters and producers during the said fiscal year, it is well to observe, first, that these inquiries come from exporters as well as producers, and that there is no division as to how many inquiries come from producers and how many come from exporters. From all the data available at this time, the friends of agriculture are thoroughly convinced that their marketing machinery is better safeguarded by retaining the same in the hands of the Department of Agriculture, and that all of the pertinent data necessary for advice in marketing raw products is available through that department, and that if any expansion is made extending such inquiries in behalf of the producers it should be made through the Department of Agriculture, and not by placing such authority in the hands of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT].

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there was a time when Secretary Hoover had the entire confidence of the people of this country, and I believe that to-day he has not forfeited or lost that confidence in any degree. [Applause.] If there is any official of the Government to-day who has the entire confidence of the business people of the country, it is the head of the Department of Commerce.

As I understand, this is the familiar question: Shall we accept the recommendation of a department which has been overruled or pared down by the Bureau of the Budget, or, in the desire for a very rigid economy, shall we overrule the estimates of the department? As far as I am concerned, in a matter of this sort I am willing to sustain the recommendations of the Department of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce practically advises us that he considers that an increase in the number of his commercial attachés will be very much in the interest of the extension and development of our foreign trade. If there is one department whose activities have a direct bearing upon our prosperity, it is that department, charged, as it is, with the development of our foreign trade. What most impresses the traveler in the Far East is how undermanned is American trade in that region of the world and at how great a disadvantage we are at as compared with Great Britain and other foreign countries. That is so in Shanghai and the other important points in China and is evident also in the Malay Peninsula. I remember in Singapore meeting with a few American gentlemen at the invitation of the American consul. One of them told me he thought he was the only representative of an American business house in Singapore, and that was one of the leading chewing-gum concerns. Think of it—that in that market, one of the greatest in the Far East, the only business maintaining a special agency was one of that nature. There had been others, I was told, which for one reason or another had been discontinued; and it struck me what a wonderful opportunity was there for a general agency to promote our trade in that particular market. These commercial attachés, as I understand it, are the special representatives of the American business people generally, particularly the smaller American industrial concerns looking for foreign trade. The larger concerns, such as the General Electric and the Standard Oil Co., have their representatives in China, but you will find no one except the commercial attachés or the commercial agents specially charged with the exploitation of the interests of the great multitude of smaller concerns whose products might find a market in those fields.

If it is true that this great increase in our foreign commerce in finished products is due in large part to the services of these commercial attachés, it surely furnishes ample warrant for acceding to the recommendation of the Secretary of Commerce for this slight increase of appropriation to enable the department to cover other important trade centers now uncovered. I believe we will make no mistake in adopting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is well we remember what we have under consideration, and that is an

amendment to increase the number of employees of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce. Now I shall not make any fight upon the existing activities of the department, and I shall not make any fight upon the existing appropriation. I do think that if a proper inquiry and investigation were made of both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce a great deal of duplication would be found, and a large saving could be effected without any harmful effect to the Government. We need not discuss that at this place. It would serve no useful purpose because at this particular time we have no opportunity to correct it. In my district I have found one situation to exist well nigh universal, and that is the people are becoming uneasy, dissatisfied at the large increase of the Government pay roll. [Applause.] And in the few times that I have had an opportunity to address them recently I have pledged them my support in an effort to keep down any further increase in the number of Government employees, and I have told them that there is but one way to do it; not two ways, not a half dozen ways, but just one way, and that is to stand up on the floor of Congress and fight against these propositions which propose to enlarge and increase the activities of the Federal Government. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I want to say just these few words more. It is an easy matter to exaggerate the importance of the work that most any of these Government bureaus are doing.

I do not question the good motives of their spokesmen who come before the committees of Congress and enlarge upon the vital importance of their tasks. Most of them verily believe that the prosperity and happiness of the country would come to an end if their expansion were halted.

There are those of us here who take a different view. I belong to that number. It is my view that Congress can better spend its time in coordinating and harmonizing the activities of the Government bureaus we do have, so as to prevent waste and duplication of effort, than to add on more new employees.

I am none too sanguine that very much will be accomplished along that line, at least very soon. But in the meanwhile, while we wait, we Members of Congress who really believe in economy and try to practice it can render a very useful service in helping to hold down the ever-enlarging number of Federal employees. I shall continue to try to do my best along that line.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the interest manifested in the analysis of the income-tax figures as presented by me last year seems to warrant a further consideration of the application and collection of personal-income taxes. This is undertaken, therefore, based on the report recently issued of the transactions for 1922, the latest completed compilation of the Treasury Department.

While there are some slight changes from the figures of 1921, used as the basis for last year's analysis, by far the major portion of the burden is still, I believe, being disproportionately borne by the income-tax payers of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio.

It follows, therefore, as a natural sequence that the people of these individual States who file 2,357,340 personal-income-tax returns, representing 34.74 per cent of the entire number filed, are carrying on their professional and commercial activities under a tax load which can not otherwise than be a brake upon the wheels of permanent progress and a drag on initiative and enterprise.

The agricultural West is having its burdens alleviated, but the industrial East is very heavily burdened; its load is inequitable, and that it should have priority consideration by the Congress is strikingly shown in several ways.

A simple comparison of the wealth of these 4 industrial States with that of the other 44 States and the amount of taxes collected in each group discloses one phase.

A comparison of the numerical representation of each group in the Congress shows another.

A still further inequity is shown in the returns yielded through State-aid projects.

A glance at the following table shows these inequities in inescapable facts and figures:

	4 States, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio	The 44 other States
Wealth, Government census 1922	\$96,000,000,000	\$218,000,000,000
Percentage of wealth paid out for taxes	0.0467	0.0191
Personal income taxes paid in 1922	\$447,000,000	\$413,000,000
Received as State aid	\$12,000,000	\$64,000,000
Number of Senators	8	88
Number of Congressmen	113	322

¹ Almost two and a half times the amount paid by 44 States.

² \$34,000,000 more than the amount paid by 44 States.

³ \$52,000,000 less than the amount received by 44 States.

On the basis of wealth the four States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio should have paid \$265,000,000 in personal income taxes. Compare this with the amount paid—\$447,000,000—and you will see that these States have an overpayment of 70 per cent, because the individuals living therein have an overassessment to that extent.

On this same basis of wealth the group comprising the 44 States should have paid \$595,000,000 instead of \$413,000,000, the amount collected according to the 1922 figures, \$182,000,000 less than in proportion to their wealth by the last census of 1922.

Still considering the wealth of the two groups we see that the four States with considerably less than a third of the total wealth of the country, as indicated by the census, pay thirty-seven times as much to the Federal Government in personal income taxes as they receive in "State aid" funds. Compare this with the "State aid" paid to the 44 States, and it will be seen that they pay only six and a half times the amount of the "aid" in income taxes from the residents of all of those States combined. In other words, they receive nearly six times on the average what the four States—New York, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—receive.

The wide discrepancies in regard to the proportion of taxes paid and State aid received is graphically set out in the table which the Washington Post has kindly allowed me to use. I insert it here as collateral evidence to the conclusions which my examination into the facts disclose bearing on this inequitable feature of our present system of income tax collecting and the necessity at an early date of there being prompt reform in this particular.

Proportion of Federal subsidies to United States taxes paid by each State

[This table shows the amount of Federal taxes each State paid in the fiscal year 1923-24 and the amount the State received in Federal aid.]

State	Paid in Federal taxes, including personal income taxes	Received as State aid ¹	Per cent
Alabama	\$9,800,970	\$1,705,610	17.40
Arizona	2,131,288	995,331	42.00
Arkansas	6,536,635	1,361,459	20.82
California	120,026,453	2,475,800	1.91
Colorado	15,228,037	1,294,448	8.50
Connecticut	37,006,532	538,009	1.45
Delaware	10,805,101	379,330	3.51
Florida	15,819,827	910,084	5.75
Georgia	19,181,446	2,137,684	11.14
Idaho	1,976,084	905,827	45.08
Illinois	214,840,722	3,390,701	1.57
Indiana	45,767,607	2,034,555	4.44
Iowa	17,946,204	2,149,551	11.97
Kansas	20,735,282	2,036,124	9.81
Kentucky	28,574,914	1,592,612	5.57
Louisiana	20,427,382	1,090,011	5.37
Maine	13,945,902	704,496	5.05
Maryland	34,349,218	714,774	2.77
Massachusetts	138,681,654	1,196,042	.86
Michigan	221,380,005	2,339,430	1.05
Minnesota	31,586,633	2,157,830	6.83
Mississippi	4,949,236	1,428,199	28.55
Missouri	68,794,487	2,503,602	3.62
Montana	2,958,039	1,448,635	48.97
Nebraska	10,791,615	1,555,586	14.41
Nevada	761,499	885,759	116.31
New Hampshire	5,805,346	337,827	5.81
New Jersey	112,260,046	1,109,187	.98
New Mexico	1,131,323	1,119,086	98.91
New York	690,415,425	4,020,445	.58
North Carolina	157,973,393	1,873,830	1.18
North Dakota	1,282,838	1,142,382	89.05
Ohio	153,524,832	3,026,236	1.97
Oklahoma	13,520,536	1,813,931	13.41
Oregon	10,500,237	1,138,143	10.83
Pennsylvania	269,688,619	3,796,118	1.40

¹ These figures do not include small payments made under minor subsidy measures.

Proportion of Federal subsidies to United States taxes paid by each State—Continued

State	Paid in Federal taxes, including personal income taxes	Received as State aid	Per cent
Rhode Island	\$20,239,353	\$371,864	1.88
South Carolina	8,938,278	1,178,110	13.18
South Dakota	1,951,248	1,175,515	60.24
Tennessee	18,633,646	1,754,211	9.41
Texas	36,863,758	4,448,314	12.06
Utah	4,087,186	816,876	19.98
Vermont	3,600,827	382,681	10.62
Virginia	45,991,886	1,599,270	3.47
Washington	19,006,008	1,111,660	5.84
West Virginia	19,895,467	917,127	4.60
Wisconsin	40,448,722	1,951,718	4.82
Wyoming	2,088,353	880,051	42.14
Total	\$2,761,850,099	\$75,955,121	-----

In arriving at the above-mentioned conclusion an analysis was made not only of the total amounts paid by the respective States as compared with the total amount collected in the United States and its possessions, but I also considered the number of personal income-tax payers in each State as compared with the total population, according to the last census, of the respective States. By this method the following shows the comparative tax-paying strength of each individual State in totals and percentages.

New Jersey had a population of 3,315,231, or 3.03 per cent of the entire population of the United States as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 3,155,900, or 2.98 per cent according to 1920 census, an increase of 159,331, or 0.05 per cent.

Personal income tax paid by individuals filing reports therein in 1922 of \$40,982,616, or 4.76 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$33,258,294, or 4.62 per cent, an increase of \$7,724,322, or 0.14 per cent.

Paid more in 1922 than the total tax paid by 21 States and Hawaii combined, as follows, increasing its burden in 1922 over 1921 by the amount paid by the whole State of Tennessee, as per the following table:

States	Amount of personal income tax paid	Per cent of tax	Per cent of population	Population
North Carolina	\$4,908,611	0.57	2.42	2,649,982
Florida	4,059,859	.47	.93	1,024,054
Kansas	3,246,097	.38	1.63	1,789,423
Nebraska	3,165,433	.37	1.21	1,323,193
Alabama	2,892,298	.34	2.19	2,402,273
Arkansas	2,314,409	.27	1.64	1,797,978
New Hampshire	2,133,631	.25	.41	446,304
Delaware	1,833,712	.21	.21	228,330
Mississippi	1,803,632	.21	1.63	1,790,613
Vermont	1,573,555	.18	.32	352,423
Hawaii	1,387,398	.16	.25	272,392
South Carolina	1,268,305	.15	1.58	1,727,070
Montana	1,029,195	.12	.54	593,396
Utah	955,929	.11	.43	468,979
Wyoming	687,062	.08	.19	206,575
Arizona	687,026	.08	.34	367,589
Idaho	548,688	.06	.59	650,108
North Dakota	478,706	.06	.42	459,233
New Mexico	453,219	.05	.61	664,850
Nevada	383,750	.04	.34	368,861
Nevada	258,732	.03	.07	77,407
Total	\$36,069,247	4.19	17.95	19,661,343
Tennessee	\$4,902,612	.57	2.17	2,377,308
Total	\$40,971,859	4.76	20.12	22,038,651
1921 (except Tennessee)	\$31,337,009	4.36	18.02	19,122,259

Per cent of increase in total tax paid for all States in 1922 over 1921..... 19.69
Per cent of increase in total tax paid for New Jersey in 1922 over 1921..... 23.22

New York had a population of 10,712,680, or 9.78 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 10,385,227, or 9.80 per cent, according to the 1920 census, an increase of 327,453; personal income tax paid by individuals filing reports therein in 1922 was \$273,960,079, or 31.82 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$210,768,379, or 29.30 per cent, an increase of \$63,191,700, or 2.52 per cent; paid more in 1922 than the total tax paid by 43 States and Hawaii combined, taking on the amount paid by the State of Ohio over the amount paid in 1921, as follows:

States	Amount of personal income tax paid	Per cent of tax	Per cent of population	Population
Michigan	\$34,965,003	4.06	3.55	3,889,418
Missouri	15,472,708	1.86	3.13	3,432,566
Maryland	13,363,765	1.79	1.36	1,489,399
Texas	14,119,655	1.64	4.44	4,860,688
Connecticut	13,130,562	1.52	1.32	1,449,097
Indiana	9,578,511	1.11	2.73	2,989,493
Minnesota	9,419,301	1.09	2.25	2,467,318
Rhode Island	9,351,580	1.08	.57	620,308
Wisconsin	9,126,855	1.06	2.47	2,708,858
District of Columbia	8,326,587	.97	.40	437,571
Oklahoma	6,414,336	.74	1.94	2,123,851
Iowa	5,466,397	.63	2.24	2,450,180
Louisiana	5,353,574	.62	1.67	1,835,106
Washington	5,148,477	.60	1.34	1,466,926
Virginia	4,919,485	.57	2.16	2,372,940
North Carolina	4,908,611	.57	2.42	2,649,982
Tennessee	4,902,612	.57	2.17	2,377,308
Colorado	4,869,555	.57	.89	975,837
Kentucky	4,676,804	.54	2.24	2,449,263
West Virginia	4,594,653	.53	1.39	1,526,169
Georgia	4,557,799	.53	2.71	2,969,664
Oregon	4,239,789	.49	.74	811,875
Florida	4,059,859	.47	.93	1,024,054
Maine	3,896,892	.45	.71	774,617
Kansas	3,246,097	.38	1.63	1,789,423
Nebraska	3,165,433	.37	1.21	1,323,193
Alabama	2,892,298	.34	2.19	2,402,273
Arkansas	2,314,409	.27	1.64	1,797,978
New Hampshire	2,133,631	.25	.41	446,304
Delaware	1,833,712	.21	.21	228,330
Mississippi	1,803,632	.21	1.63	1,790,618
Vermont	1,573,555	.18	.32	352,428
Hawaii	1,387,398	.16	.25	272,392
South Carolina	1,268,305	.15	1.68	1,727,070
Montana	1,029,195	.12	.54	593,396
Utah	955,929	.11	.43	468,979
Wyoming	687,062	.08	.19	296,875
Arizona	687,026	.08	.34	367,589
South Dakota	548,688	.06	.59	650,408
Idaho	478,706	.06	.42	450,233
North Dakota	453,219	.05	.61	664,850
New Mexico	383,750	.04	.34	368,861
Nevada	258,732	.03	.07	77,407
Ohio	234,474,115	27.21	60.37	66,139,765
	39,310,406	4.57	5.49	6,014,914
Total	273,784,521	31.78	65.86	72,154,679
1921 (except Ohio)	205,578,692	28.59	60.58	64,236,596

Per cent of increase in tax paid for all States in 1922 over 1921..... 19.69
 Per cent of increase in tax paid for New York in 1922 over 1921..... 29.98

Pennsylvania had a population of 8,991,666, or 8.21 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 8,720,017, or 8.23 per cent, according to the 1920 census, an increase of 271,649; personal income tax paid by individuals filing reports therein in 1922 was \$93,573,559, or 10.87 per cent, as compared with a total tax paid in 1921 of \$84,660,220, or 11.76 per cent, an increase of \$8,913,339; paid more in 1922 than the total tax paid by 31 States and Hawaii combined:

States	Amount of personal income tax paid	Per cent of tax	Per cent of population	Population
Oklahoma	\$6,414,336	0.74	1.94	2,123,850
Louisiana	5,353,574	.62	1.67	1,835,106
Washington	5,148,477	.60	1.34	1,466,926
Virginia	4,919,485	.57	2.16	2,372,940
North Carolina	4,908,611	.57	2.42	2,649,982
Tennessee	4,902,612	.57	2.17	2,377,308
Colorado	4,869,555	.57	.89	975,837
Kentucky	4,676,804	.54	2.24	2,449,263
West Virginia	4,594,653	.53	1.39	1,526,169
Georgia	4,557,799	.53	2.71	2,969,664
Oregon	4,239,789	.49	.74	811,875
Florida	4,059,859	.47	.93	1,024,054
Maine	3,896,892	.45	.71	774,617
Kansas	3,246,097	.38	1.63	1,789,423
Nebraska	3,165,433	.37	1.21	1,323,193
Alabama	2,892,298	.34	2.19	2,402,273
Arkansas	2,314,409	.27	1.64	1,797,978
New Hampshire	2,133,631	.25	.41	446,304
Delaware	1,833,712	.21	.21	228,330
Mississippi	1,803,632	.21	1.63	1,790,618
Vermont	1,573,555	.18	.32	352,428
Hawaii	1,387,398	.16	.25	272,392
South Carolina	1,268,305	.15	1.68	1,727,070
Montana	1,029,195	.12	.54	593,396
Utah	955,929	.11	.43	468,979
Wyoming	687,062	.08	.19	296,875
Arizona	687,026	.08	.34	367,589
South Dakota	548,688	.06	.59	650,408
Idaho	478,706	.06	.42	450,233
North Dakota	453,219	.05	.61	664,850
New Mexico	383,750	.04	.34	368,861
Nevada	258,732	.03	.07	77,407

States	Amount of personal income tax paid	Per cent of tax	Per cent of population	Population
North Dakota	\$453,219	0.05	0.61	664,850
New Mexico	383,750	.04	.34	368,861
Nevada	258,732	.03	.07	77,407
Total	89,643,193	10.40	35.91	39,844,899
1921 totals	79,461,602	11.04	36.09	38,274,838

Per cent of increase in total tax paid for all States in 1922 over 1921..... 19.69
 Per cent of increase in total tax paid for Pennsylvania in 1922 over 1921..... 10.53

Ohio had a population of 6,014,914, or 5.49 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 5,759,394, or 5.43 per cent, according to the 1920 census, an increase of 255,520, or 0.06 per cent; personal income tax paid by individuals filing reports therein in 1922 was \$39,310,406, or 4.57 per cent, as compared with a total tax paid in 1921 of \$33,574,004, or 4.67 per cent, an increase of \$5,736,312; paid more in 1922 than the total tax paid by 20 States and Hawaii combined, as follows:

States	Amount of personal income tax paid	Per cent of tax	Per cent of population	Population
North Carolina	\$4,908,611	0.57	2.42	2,649,982
Florida	4,059,859	.47	.93	1,024,054
Kansas	3,246,097	.38	1.63	1,789,423
Nebraska	3,165,433	.37	1.21	1,323,193
Alabama	2,892,298	.34	2.19	2,402,273
Arkansas	2,314,409	.27	1.63	1,797,978
New Hampshire	2,133,631	.25	.41	446,304
Delaware	1,833,712	.21	.21	228,330
Mississippi	1,803,632	.21	1.60	1,790,618
Vermont	1,573,555	.18	.32	352,428
Hawaii	1,387,398	.16	.25	272,392
South Carolina	1,268,305	.15	1.68	1,727,070
Montana	1,029,195	.12	.54	593,396
Utah	955,929	.11	.43	468,979
Wyoming	687,062	.08	.19	296,875
Arizona	687,026	.08	.34	367,589
South Dakota	548,688	.06	.59	650,408
Idaho	478,706	.06	.42	450,233
North Dakota	453,219	.05	.61	664,850
New Mexico	383,750	.04	.34	368,861
Nevada	258,732	.03	.07	77,407
Total	36,069,247	4.19	17.95	19,661,343
1921 totals	31,337,009	4.36	18.02	19,122,259

Per cent of increase in total tax paid for all States in 1922 over 1921..... 19.69
 Per cent of increase in total tax paid for Ohio in 1922 over 1921..... 17.08

Alabama had a population of 2,402,273, or 2.19 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 2,348,174, or 2.22 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 54,099; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$2,892,298, or 0.34 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$2,713,826, or 0.33 per cent, an increase of \$178,472 over 1921, or 6.58 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by six States combined, as follows: Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Arizona had a population of 367,589, or 0.34 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 334,162, or 0.31 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 33,427; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$687,026, or 0.08 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$516,637, or 0.07 per cent, an increase of \$170,389 over 1921, or 32.98 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by two States combined, as follows: New Mexico and Nevada.

Arkansas had a population of 1,797,978, or 1.64 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 1,752,204, or 1.65 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 45,774. Paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$2,314,409, or 27 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$1,866,164, or 0.26 per cent, an increase of \$448,245 over 1921, or 24.02 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by four States combined, as follows: Utah, Idaho, North Dakota, and New Mexico.

California had a population of 3,697,070, or 3.37 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 3,426,861, or 3.23 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 270,209. Paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$43,778,932, or

5.09 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$36,438,432, or 5.06 per cent, an increase of \$7,340,500 over 1921, or 20.14 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by 21 States and Hawaii combined, as follows: North Carolina, Colorado, Florida, Kansas, Nebraska, Alabama, Arkansas, New Hampshire, Delaware, Mississippi, Vermont, Hawaii, South Carolina, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Colorado had a population of 975,837, or 0.89 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 939,639, or 0.89 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 36,198; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$4,869,555, or 0.57 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$3,862,862, or 0.54 per cent, an increase of \$1,006,693 over 1921, or 26.06 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by seven States combined, as follows: Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, and North Dakota.

Connecticut had a population of 1,449,097, or 1.32 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 1,380,631, or 1.30 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 68,466; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$13,130,562, or 1.52 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$10,633,045, or 1.48 per cent, an increase of \$2,497,517 over 1921, or 23.49 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by 12 States and Hawaii combined, as follows: Mississippi, Vermont, Hawaii, South Carolina, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Delaware had a population of 228,330, or 0.21 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 223,003, or 0.21 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 5,327; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$1,833,712, or 0.21 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$1,284,365, or 0.18 per cent, an increase of \$549,347 over 1921, or 42.77 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by four States combined, as follows: South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, and Nevada.

District of Columbia had a population of 437,571, or 0.40 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated); paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$8,336,587, or 0.97 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$7,704,564, or 1.08 per cent, an increase of \$632,023 over 1921, or 8.20 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by 10 States combined, as follows: Mississippi, Vermont, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Florida had a population of 1,024,054, or 0.93 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 968,470, or 0.91 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 55,584; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$4,059,859, or 0.47 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$2,929,409, or 0.41 per cent, an increase of \$1,130,450 over 1921, or 38.59 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by seven States combined, as follows: Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Georgia had a population of 2,969,664, or 2.71 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 2,895,832, or 2.73 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 73,832; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$4,557,769, or 0.53 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$3,892,645, or 0.54 per cent, an increase of \$665,124 over 1921, or 17.09 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by eight States combined, as follows: Montana, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Idaho had a population of 459,233, or 0.42 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 431,866, or 0.41 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 27,367; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$478,706, or 0.06 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$493,658, or 0.07 per cent, an increase of \$14,952 over 1921, or 3.03 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than North Dakota.

Illinois had a population of 6,703,312, or 6.12 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 6,485,280, or 6.12 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 218,032; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$77,196,407, or 8.96 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$68,574,351, or 9.53 per cent, an increase of \$8,622,056 over 1921, or 12.57 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by 28 States and Hawaii com-

bined, as follows: Oklahoma, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Colorado, Kentucky, West Virginia, Georgia, Florida, Maine, Kansas, Nebraska, Alabama, Arkansas, New Hampshire, Delaware, Mississippi, Vermont, Hawaii, South Carolina, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Indiana had a population of 2,989,493, or 2.73 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 2,933,390, or 2.77 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 56,103; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$9,578,511, or 1.11 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$8,973,653, or 1.25 per cent, an increase of \$604,858 over 1921, or 6.74 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by 10 States and Hawaii combined, as follows: Vermont, Hawaii, South Carolina, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, and New Mexico.

Iowa had a population of 2,450,180, or 2.24 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 2,404,021, or 2.27 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 46,159; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$5,466,397, or 0.63 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$5,837,960, or 0.81 per cent, a decrease of \$371,563 under 1921, or 6.36 per cent decrease under tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by eight States combined, as follows: Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, and New Mexico.

Kansas had a population of 1,789,423, or 1.63 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 1,769,257, or 1.67 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 20,166; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$3,246,097, or 0.38 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$3,392,429, or 0.47 per cent, a decrease of \$146,332 under 1921, or 4.31 per cent decrease under tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by six States combined, as follows: Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, and New Mexico.

Kentucky had a population of 2,449,263, or 2.24 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 2,416,630, or 2.28 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 32,633; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$4,676,804, or 0.54 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$4,297,470, or 0.60 per cent, an increase of \$379,334 over 1921, or 8.63 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by eight States combined, as follows: Montana, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Louisiana had a population of 1,835,106, or 1.67 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 1,798,509, or 1.70 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 36,597; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$5,353,574, or 0.62 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$5,304,522, or 0.74 per cent, an increase of \$49,052 over 1921, or 0.92 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid more in 1922 than the total tax paid by eight States combined, as follows: Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, and New Mexico.

Maine had a population of 774,617, or 0.71 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 768,014, or 0.72 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 6,603; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$3,896,892, or 0.45 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$3,974,861, or 0.55 per cent, a decrease of \$77,969 under 1921 or 1.96 per cent decrease under tax paid in 1921; paid more in 1922 than the total tax paid by six States combined, as follows: Montana, Wyoming, South Dakota, Arizona, Idaho, and North Dakota.

Maryland had a population of 1,489,399, or 1.36 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 1,449,661, or 1.37 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 38,738; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$15,363,765, or 1.79 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$14,537,303, or 2.03 per cent, an increase of \$826,462 over 1921, or 5.62 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid more in 1922 than the total tax paid by 13 States and Hawaii combined, as follows: New Hampshire, Delaware, Mississippi, Vermont, Hawaii, South Carolina, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, and New Mexico.

Massachusetts had a population of 3,977,490, or 3.63 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 3,852,356, or 3.63 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 125,134; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$57,781,194, or 6.72 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$46,534,644, or 6.47 per cent, an increase of \$11,246,550 over 1921, or 24.17 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid

more in 1922 than the total tax paid by 23 States, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia combined, as follows: District of Columbia, North Carolina, Colorado, Georgia, Florida, Maine, Kansas, Nebraska, Alabama, Arkansas, New Hampshire, Delaware, Mississippi, Vermont, Hawaii, South Carolina, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Michigan had a population of 3,880,418, or 3.55 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 3,668,412, or 3.40 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 221,006; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$34,965,003, or 4.06 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$24,197,840, or 3.36 per cent, an increase of \$10,767,163 over 1921, or 44.50 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid more in 1922 than the total tax paid by 19 States and Hawaii combined, as follows: Florida, Maine, Kansas, Nebraska, Alabama, Arkansas, New Hampshire, Delaware, Mississippi, Vermont, Hawaii, South Carolina, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, and New Mexico.

Minnesota had a population of 2,467,318, or 2.25 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 2,387,125, or 2.25 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 80,193; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$9,419,301, or 1.09 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$8,697,117, or 1.21 per cent, an increase of \$722,184 over 1921, or 8.30 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by 10 States combined, as follows: Arkansas, Mississippi, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, and New Mexico.

Mississippi had a population of 1,790,618, or 1.63 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 1,790,618, or 1.69 per cent, according to 1920 census; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$1,803,632, or 0.21 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$1,069,136, or 0.15 per cent, an increase of \$734,496 over 1921, or 68.70 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by four States combined, as follows: Wyoming, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Missouri had a population of 3,432,566, or 3.13 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 3,404,055, or 3.21 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 28,511; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$15,972,706, or 1.86 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$14,660,351, or 2.04 per cent, an increase of \$1,312,355 over 1921, or 8.95 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by 14 States and Hawaii combined, as follows: New Hampshire, Delaware, Mississippi, Vermont, Hawaii, South Carolina, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Montana had a population of 593,396, or 0.54 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 548,889, or 0.52 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 44,507; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$1,029,195, or 0.12 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$1,051,862, or 0.15 per cent, a decrease of \$22,667 under 1921, or 2.15 per cent decrease under tax paid in 1921; paid more in 1922 than the total tax paid by two States combined, as follows: North Dakota and New Mexico.

Nebraska had a population of 1,323,193, or 1.21 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 1,296,372, or 1.22 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 26,821; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$3,165,433, or 0.37 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$3,328,145, or 0.46 per cent, a decrease of \$162,712 under 1921, or 4.89 per cent decrease under tax paid in 1921; paid more in 1922 than the total tax paid by six States combined, as follows: Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, and Nevada.

Nevada had a population of 77,407, or 0.07 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 77,407, or 0.07 per cent, according to 1920 census; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$258,732, or 0.03 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$329,296, or 0.5 per cent, a decrease of \$70,564 under 1921, or 21.42 per cent decrease under tax paid in 1921; Nevada has a smaller population and pays less tax than any other State.

New Hampshire had a population of 446,304, or 0.41 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 443,083, or 0.42 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 3,221; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$2,133,631, or 0.25 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$1,759,290, or 0.24 per cent, an increase of \$374,341 over 1921, or 21.28 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid more in 1922 than the total tax paid by five States combined, as follows: South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

New Mexico had a population of 368,861, or 0.34 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 360,350, or 0.34 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 8,511; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$383,750, or 0.04 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$351,629, or 0.05 per cent, an increase of \$32,121 over 1921, or 9.13 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by one State, namely, Nevada.

North Carolina had a population of 2,649,982, or 2.42 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 2,559,123, or 2.41 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 90,859; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$4,908,611, or 0.57 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$3,760,499, or 0.52 per cent, an increase of \$1,148,112 over 1921, or 30.53 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by seven States combined, as follows: Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, and North Dakota.

North Dakota had a population of 664,850, or 0.61 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 646,872, or 0.61 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 17,978; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$453,219, or 0.05 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$485,783, or 0.07 per cent, a decrease of \$32,564 under 1921 or 6.7 per cent decrease under tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than New Mexico.

Oklahoma had a population of 2,123,851, or 1.94 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 2,028,293, or 1.91 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 95,558; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$6,414,336, or 0.74 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$4,206,507, or 0.58 per cent, an increase of \$2,207,829 over 1921, or 52.49 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by nine States combined, as follows: Delaware, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Oregon had a population of 811,875, or 0.74 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 783,389, or 0.74 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 28,486; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$4,239,789, or 0.49 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$4,951,580, or 0.68 per cent, a decrease of \$711,791 under 1921, or 14.38 per cent decrease under tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by seven States combined, as follows: Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, and New Mexico.

Rhode Island had a population of 620,308, or 0.57 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 604,397, or 0.57 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 15,911; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$9,351,580, or 1.08 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$9,236,328, or 1.28 per cent, an increase of \$115,252 over 1921 or 1.25 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by 11 States combined, as follows: Mississippi, Vermont, South Carolina, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

South Carolina had a population of 1,727,070, or 1.58 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 1,683,724, or 1.59 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 43,346; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$1,268,305, or 0.15 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$1,246,523, or 0.17 per cent, an increase of \$21,782 over 1921 or 1.75 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by three States combined, as follows: South Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

South Dakota had a population of 650,108, or 0.59 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 636,547, or 0.60 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 13,561; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$548,688, or 0.06 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$524,653, or 0.07 per cent, an increase of \$24,035 over 1921 or 4.58 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by one State, namely, Idaho.

Tennessee had a population of 2,377,308, or 2.17 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 2,337,885, or 2.21 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 39,423; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$4,902,612, or 0.57 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$3,984,051, or 0.55 per cent, an increase of \$918,561 over 1921, or 23.06 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by seven States combined, as follows: Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, and North Dakota.

Texas had a population of 4,860,658, or 4.44 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 4,663,228, or 4.40 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase

of 197,430; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$14,119,635, or 1.64 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$12,667,894, or 1.76 per cent, an increase of \$1,451,761 over 1921, or 11.46 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by 13 States and Hawaii combined, as follows: Delaware, Mississippi, Vermont, Hawaii, South Carolina, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Utah had a population of 468,979, or 0.43 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 449,396, or 0.42 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 19,583; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$955,929, or 0.11 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$842,904, or 0.12 per cent, an increase of \$113,025 over 1921, or 13.41 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by two States combined, as follows: North Dakota and New Mexico.

Vermont had a population of 352,428, or 0.32 per cent as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 352,428, or 0.33 per cent, according to 1920 census; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$1,573,555, or 0.18 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$1,155,767, or 0.16 per cent, an increase of \$417,788 over 1921, or 36.15 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by three States combined, as follows: Wyoming, Idaho, and New Mexico.

Virginia had a population of 2,372,940, or 2.16 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 2,309,187, or 2.18 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 63,753; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$4,919,485, or 0.57 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$4,161,116, or 0.58 per cent, an increase of \$758,369 over 1921, or 18.23 per cent; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by eight States combined, as follows: Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Washington, including Alaska, had a population of 1,466,926, or 1.34 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 1,411,520, or 1.33 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 55,406; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$5,148,477, or 0.60 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$4,909,857, or 0.68 per cent, an increase of \$238,620 over 1921, or 4.86 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by eight States combined, as follows: Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, and Nevada.

West Virginia had a population of 1,526,160, or 1.39 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 1,463,701, or 1.38 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 62,468; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$4,594,653, or 0.53 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$4,579,113, or 0.64 per cent, an increase of \$15,540 over 1921, or 0.34 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by eight States combined, as follows: Montana, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Wisconsin had a population of 2,708,853, or 2.47 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 2,632,067, or 2.48 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 76,791; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$9,126,855, or 1.06 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$8,971,044, or 1.25 per cent, an increase of \$155,811 over 1921 or 1.74 per cent increase over tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by 11 States combined, as follows: Arkansas, South Carolina, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, South Dakota, Idaho, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Nevada.

Wyoming had a population of 206,875, or 0.19 per cent, as of July 1, 1922 (estimated), as compared with a population of 194,402, or 0.18 per cent, according to 1920 census, an increase of 12,473; paid personal income tax in 1922 of \$687,062, or 0.08 per cent, as compared with a total tax in 1921 of \$783,257, or 0.11 per cent, a decrease of \$96,195 under 1921, or 12.28 per cent decrease under tax paid in 1921; paid in 1922 more than the total tax paid by two States combined, as follows: New Mexico and Nevada.

I think we are all agreed that the most effectual way of reducing taxes is by reducing unnecessary appropriations. This can be done and has been done by your committee in framing this bill. We are constantly on the lookout for reductions through the elimination of possible waste, duplication of effort, and overlapping of bureau or departmental activities.

At the same time we recognize the undesirability of adopting a policy of "cheeseparing" as against a policy of real economy. There is a vast difference, although sometimes a moment's reflection is required to see the advisability of mak-

ing an immediate expenditure which will not show results until some time in the future, as against an immediate saving of the amount in question and then being forced to expend a larger amount later. Such distinctions your committee has very carefully and thoroughly considered as we have in mind the diminishing of the tax burden through reduced appropriations. This is the logical foundation for subsequent legislation revising the tax rates downward, and as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. MADDEN] has stated, a saving of \$332,127,933.50 has been made under the Budget estimates since the Bureau of the Budget was formed.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, the House will pass H. R. 11791, commonly referred to as the public buildings bill. An appropriation of \$150,000,000 is authorized to carry out the purposes of the act, only \$25,000,000 of which is available for any one year.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to carry on the construction work. In so far as the construction of buildings to be used in whole or in part for post office purposes the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General act jointly in the selection of towns or cities in which buildings are to be constructed, in the selection of sites therein, and in determining the dimensions of the buildings, and the arrangement of space.

The last general public buildings bill was passed in 1913, and carried authorizations amounting to about \$40,000,000. Since the buildings then authorized were completed, no Government buildings have been erected. During that time the business of the Federal Government has increased in every line of activity. As a result the rent charges have increased enormously. We are to-day paying out over \$24,000,000 annually for quarters in which to do the necessary business of the Nation. So it is apparent that building activity must and should be resumed, and considering the situation confronting us the amount authorized is reasonable.

The act proposes a departure from the custom heretofore followed in that it takes away from Congress the function of establishing public buildings and places it under the direction and control of executive departments. Heretofore Congress has specifically provided by legislation for the places where public buildings were to be constructed and the maximum amounts that could be expended at the places designated. Congress has defined its intentions with respect to what was to be done under the law, and the manner in which it was to be done, with great precision as indicated by the many statutes in relation thereto that have been enacted.

It is claimed for the act that it eliminates all political considerations in the matter of locations and will tend to bring about a more efficient and comprehensive building program. On its face it seems to be a step in advance. The success of the plan depends upon the general scheme adopted for the determination of locations. If it be the intention to favor the larger centers to the entire exclusion of smaller, then great opposition to the plan will arise. The population of a town where a public building may be contemplated must not be the controlling factor. On this point I call the attention of the Members to an actual situation.

Along our Canadian border we have many places with small population that have become important ports of entry. Such a port is Derby Line in Vermont. The international boundary line divides a village, one portion of which is in Canada and known as Rock Island, the other portion in Vermont and known as Derby Line. The United States maintains at Derby Line a customs office and an immigration office. The customs office occupies two small rooms in the end of a hotel, and the immigration office a room in the ell part of the same hotel. There are six customs officials on duty all the time, but in the summer the number is increased. Two immigration inspectors are employed the year around.

The fact that this has become an important port is evidenced by the amount of business actually transacted. The official figures for 1923 show that 49,622 automobiles and 1,924 teams entered from Canada, carrying 129,726 persons, all of whom were examined as required by law, rules, and regulations. In 1924, 31,162 automobiles departed to Canada and 44,365 automobiles entered the United States. The number of persons entering and examined was 157,365. The enforcement of the prohibition law entails a great amount of work, requiring the cooperation of prohibition-enforcement officers. Thousands of dollars in the way of fines are collected, requiring a great amount of detail work.

It is necessary to examine each automobile and each passenger. This examination requires a minute inspection of the luggage. The Government has no place to do this work except in the street or on the piazza of the hotel where the customs

office is located. Now, I submit that it is a shame that this great Government is compelled to do its important and necessary business under such limitations. What an inspiration to the incoming immigrant or traveler first entering the country to see its work conducted under such limited and primitive conditions!

The work of the customs and immigration service at Derby Line will increase year by year, and the port become more and more important as the years pass. No time should be wasted in erecting a substantial building that will be a credit to the country. The Canadian Government has such a building for its business in Rock Island, just across the boundary.

If the size of a city or town becomes a factor in selecting sites, then it will be a long time before the Government activities at this port will be properly housed, and the work will continue to be done under conditions that are disgraceful to any country. If the amount of business transacted has its proper consideration, there will be no delay.

Vermont is asking for another public building—a post office at Bellows Falls, a commercial center in the southern part of the State. But the size of the municipality and the amount of business transacted combine to assure the early erection of the desired and necessary building. The small towns are the ones that should receive careful consideration.

These remarks are submitted for the consideration of my fellow Members if the public buildings bill fails to pass, and for the consideration of the Treasury Department if it becomes a law.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I seldom if ever differ with my associates on the Committee on Appropriations. I do not remember when I had my last disagreement with the committee. My colleague who sits at my right [Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee], and whose amendments are now under consideration, like myself seldom disagrees with the committee. We usually stand together. But I rise at this moment to support the Byrns amendment, because I am reliably informed from a source that ought to be unquestioned that there is every need for an addition to the staff of commercial attachés now representing this Government. Hurriedly, may I be permitted to say, that investigation shows that not only has there been an earnest demand but an absolute need for 25 important foreign commercial centers still uncovered? I may repeat something that has already been said in this debate, but at the risk of doing so I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this important branch of our Federal service is left uncovered at Budapest, at Berne, at Belgrade, at Dublin, at Christania, at Liverpool, at Sydney, at Guatemala City, at Guayaquil, at La Paz, at Tampico, and Caracas, not to mention other centers of industry abroad. These centers need this sort of service, and I think we need our commercial attachés at these great cities. We have to meet strong competition in trade, and also we need these attachés for the protection of American investments abroad. The present recommendation for the Foreign Service will permit of no new offices, and therefore I am impelled, much against my personal desire—because I usually follow our chairman, Mr. MADDEN—to stand up here and advocate the adoption of the Byrns amendment, a very slight increase compared with the great work it will accomplish. It will certainly strengthen the offices abroad. Do you know that the average cost of the operation of a foreign office is \$25,000 a year? We can not fill the present needs with the appropriation asked for and with the additional sum proposed in the amendment offered by my colleague on the Committee on Appropriations, but it will help to increase the business standing of our country at the places that I have mentioned. The class of men now engaged as commercial attachés is far above what any man in this House realizes unless he has given close study to it. I have been told of a business leader, who was earning \$40,000 a year with the Regal Shoe Co., who sacrificed that position to take one of these positions abroad at a salary of but \$6,000 a year. He was in love with the service. I knew a newspaper man who adorned that press gallery, who represented a Boston newspaper, and with the various newspaper connections his earning income was at least \$10,000 a year, and he has gone abroad now at a salary of half that sum as a commercial attaché. These men love their work, and I am surprised at the rather rampaging remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], for if these men are able to find markets abroad for the farmer who ships his corn, his cotton, his tobacco, or whatever he produces, the leader of the farm bloc in this House ought to be in favor of this amendment instead of against it. [Applause.]

However, while I am on my feet, I desire to congratulate the subcommittee in charge of the appropriation now under

consideration for its excellent judgment in reporting an additional appropriation for the State Department which will enable the Bureau of Passports to establish a passport office in the city of Boston.

I have often wondered why such action has not been taken long ago. You would be greatly surprised if you knew what an immense amount of tourist travel goes out from the port of Boston, and yet it has never had an office for the obtaining of the necessary documents requisite for securing passports. New York, naturally, has one; but so have Seattle, Chicago, San Francisco, and New Orleans.

Do you know that an intending traveler from the port of Boston must either go to New York to secure his papers or write to Washington and await the pleasure of the department? Scarcely a week passes without one or more citizens of my city writing to me to expedite the issuance of the passport for which they have applied days in advance, and which has not been received by them. Many times my people have been forced to wait over for another boat than the one on which they had secured passage owing to the delay down here in forwarding the all-desired identification papers which would prove their citizenship in this country.

Assistant Secretary Wright puts it succinctly when he says:

The passport offices are the first and most tangible points of contact that the public make with the Government. If they are compelled to go from Boston to New York, or to write from Boston to Washington and wait two or three days, they get an unfortunate impression of the way the Government transacts business. We have any number of letters saying, "Why can not some scheme be devised so that if I get word that my mother or my brother is ill in England or Ireland or Italy or Germany and I have to leave to-morrow or the day after from Boston, I can get my passport without having to wait a week or 10 days for that helpful official document?"

The passport system, a war-time measure and necessary when it was established, is now a needless interference with the free movements of American citizens who travel abroad. But so long as it is kept up, Boston, the chief port of New England, certainly deserves as much in the way of convenience of obtaining the papers as any other city in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I renew my congratulations and my thanks to the committee presided over by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] for seeing the absolute necessity of incorporating in this bill a provision establishing this bureau in Boston, and I know that all New England will be grateful and most appreciative of this consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few preliminary remarks before discussing the amendments now under consideration, and I do this in the hope that I may clear away some misunderstandings relative to the bill.

In the first place, may I say that I am not in sympathy with the statements made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], in which he charges that the Department of Commerce is endeavoring, under a combined appropriation carried in the bill, to interfere with the activities of the Department of Agriculture. The subcommittee who prepared the original draft of this bill, which was later approved by the full committee, are alone responsible for combining the two appropriations to which he has referred, and it was not even suggested by any official of the Department of Commerce. Last year the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] came before our committee and pointed out that under certain language carried in a \$500,000 appropriation for rubber investigation, certain language had led to some duplication of work in foreign fields by representatives of the Agriculture and Commerce Departments. The committee very promptly made changes in the language complained of and which all agreed would avoid any duplication in the future. Since that time an Executive order has been issued requiring frequent conferences between representatives of the different Government departments in foreign fields, with a view of avoiding any interference one with the other and any duplication of work.

These conferences have been helpful, our committee was informed, and I do not think there is any foundation for the fears expressed by the gentleman from Iowa. The Department of Agriculture carries an appropriation under the head of "Agricultural economics" amounting to about \$65,000 for this particular work in foreign fields and employs not exceeding 12

representatives. The Department of Commerce has about 250 men employed in foreign fields.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I want to suggest to the gentleman that this bulletin which I have in my hand is dated January, 1925, and I have cited the clearest case of duplication that can be found anywhere. The department has not carried out the instructions which the gentleman refers to.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I was discussing the work in foreign fields. If there is any duplication in the matter of published bulletins, that is quite a different proposition and can be promptly remedied by calling it to the attention of the director of the bureau.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That does not apply to this service. This is not domestic service at all.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman is entirely correct. Coming now to the discussion of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], seeking to increase appropriations carried for the Bureau of Domestic and Foreign Commerce, I feel that these increases should not be granted, and certainly not in the way proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The subcommittee of five who prepared this bill were quite fortunate in having two distinguished business men, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN] to assist in its preparation. Mr. SHREVE, the chairman of that committee, is a man of large business interests, not only in Pennsylvania but in the South, and no one could be more fully in sympathy with the work of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce than he is. He has always been liberal in making appropriations to this bureau. Certainly, no one could be found better acquainted with and more deeply interested in the important service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce than the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN]. I think he has written into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD more accurate and informing information on our foreign trade than any other Member of the House. [Applause.] I mention this in order that you may understand that the business interests of the country have been well represented on the committee that prepared this bill, and certainly the committee was not unmindful of the useful service being rendered by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

In this connection I will add that no member of the committee has been more just, more fair in voting needful appropriations than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE]. [Applause.] As chairman of the committee, he knows no section, no politics when it comes to writing an appropriation bill. Members on my side of the aisle from Texas, North Carolina, New York, Oregon, and other States will bear willing witness to this tribute I pay him. He has never failed to give earnest and sympathetic consideration to any meritorious appeal for appropriations over which his committee has jurisdiction. [Applause.]

Should the House, after a full discussion of the pending amendments, feel that the appropriations for this bureau should be increased, then I wish to suggest that the increases be provided for in a different way from that proposed by my good friend from Tennessee.

These increases can be provided for in a thoroughly practical and businesslike way, without imposing any further burden on the Treasury and without hurt to the business interests served by this bureau. I appreciate the importance of the work of the bureau and share fully in the complimentary references made to the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hoover, and the Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Doctor Klein. Under their direction the bureau has been rendering most efficient and helpful service. There comes a time, however, when you can justly call on business men to help themselves. Under the Federal reserve system the member banks are required to keep on deposit large sums of money, which make large profits for that system and for the Government. The farmers are required, under the law, to contribute money for the payment of the salaries and expenses of the Farm Loan Board. They are doing it under an assessment plan authorized by Congress. In the naval appropriation bill we carry an appropriation for the West Indies, conditioned on a like contribution to be made by the islands. Why should not some plan be devised for business men, in a reasonable way, to contribute to a fund for any expansion of the work of the

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, if, as we are told, they insist that this work is now so urgently needed? All agree that the bureau is now performing a splendid work; that it is well organized and that it is now contributing in a most helpful way to our foreign and domestic trade, and the pending bill carries an appropriation to continue this work. It was organized, as the gentleman from Tennessee explains, in 1913. It started with only a small appropriation. This amount has been increased every year, and the present bill carries more than \$3,200,000 for its work in 1926. This represents an increase of \$142,064 over the present current year, instead of \$83,000, as the gentleman from Tennessee was inadvertently led to state.

The last year's bill for the main activities of the bureau carried \$2,835,303, and the additional sums of \$135,000 and \$105,000 for printing and contingent expenses, making the total \$3,075,303. The present bill carries \$2,919,064 for general purposes, to which must be added \$183,000 for printing and \$105,000 for contingent expenses, making the total \$3,207,064. The difference between these totals is \$92,064, to which must be added \$50,000, taken from the appropriation carried last year for the rubber investigation, and which has been added to other appropriations for this bureau. By referring to page 35 of the committee report, you will find these increases tabulated.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am interested in knowing just what increases have been made with reference to this foreign service to which these amendments apply.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I can not go into this in detail in the limited time allotted me, but I refer the gentleman to the hearings, on page 35, for the information.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think you have made any increase.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. You will find the increases in the table referred to, on page 35, in the second to the last column, and the table will give the gentleman the information he inquires about. You will remember, however, to add to the amounts mentioned in the table the items which I referred to as being carried for printing and contingent expenses.

The gentleman from Tennessee seeks to increase the appropriation for this bureau by \$315,000—the increase being carried in the five amendments he offers. The first seeks to increase the amount carried for commercial attachés, \$75,000; the second to increase the amount for promoting foreign trade in European countries and other areas, \$60,000; the third to increase the amount for the promotion of foreign trade in South and Central America, \$60,000; the fourth to increase the amount for the Far East by \$60,000, and the fifth the amount for export industries by \$60,000. The last amendment, however, I am reminded, was offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

The bill as reported for 1926 carries an increase over the current year of \$142,000, and the five amendments referred to above seek to increase this amount by \$315,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Was Secretary Hoover ever before your committee in connection with this matter?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Did he state that the department would require more than that which is appropriated?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think, in effect, he did, and I am glad the gentleman asked that question because I wish to invite his careful reading of the statements made by Mr. Hoover, as well as by Doctor Klein, before the committee.

In reply to questions from the committee, both Mr. Hoover and Doctor Klein went very fully into the work of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and as to how its work could and should be extended both at home and abroad. They both expressed the belief that without additional appropriations the work of the bureau could not be expanded.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Did you ever invite General Lord to show why he cut the estimates made by Secretary Hoover and Doctor Klein?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. I think it is highly important to know the reasons for making the cut.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Now, the gentleman from Louisiana will understand that this bill carries an increase of \$142,000 over the present current year, and I am sure that my friend from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], who has long been a member of the Appropriations Committee, will bear me out in the statement that seldom, if ever, are the requests of any department

as to the amount of its needs granted. It is not unusual for the different departments, spurred on by a very laudable ambition to grow and expand, to estimate their needs at amounts far in excess of what the Budget Bureau allows and in excess of what the committees of this House and the Congress allow.

Before the appropriating power was concentrated in one committee, the several appropriating committees of the House found it necessary to make cuts in the estimates submitted by the various Government departments, so this is not a practice that has sprung up since the Bureau of the Budget was established.

I recognize, and I am sure that every Member of the House does, that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has been doing a valuable work. It now has representatives, under the appropriations heretofore carried, at 40 different important trade centers in foreign countries. During the past year statements appearing in the hearings show that they have rendered a very remarkable service, and the committee has not only provided the fund heretofore carried for this work, but has increased the appropriation for the fiscal year 1926 by \$142,000.

There comes a time when an agency like this, if its activities are to be expanded so as to meet the needs of private business, should call upon private business to contribute in a reasonable way to the additional expense necessary for such new and extended service. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, to require a contribution from those who are primarily interested in the service offered by certain agencies of the Government is not new. I wish to suggest how the service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce can be extended in foreign fields in a way that is practical, and I think will prove agreeable to Doctor Klein and other officials of the bureau. Unquestionably, Secretary Hoover and Doctor Klein sincerely feel that the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is rendering a great service to manufacturers, exporters, and other business interests, and that it has brought large financial returns to American business men, and with additional funds our export trade can be extended. When the bureau was first organized in 1913, it started with a small appropriation. That appropriation has been steadily growing each year since 1913 and now amounts to more than \$3,200,000.

In a conversation with Doctor Klein a few days ago he stated that he felt that the business men served by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce would gladly pay \$1 for the list of foreign buyers which the bureau has been printing and distributing free. There were more than 400,000 requests for this list during the past year, and it was Doctor Klein's belief that American trade would gladly pay \$1 for this list. He estimated that from the sale of this list alone the department could realize approximately \$400,000 a year.

Now, this would impose a very small charge on the American business man, and I have an amendment which I would be glad to have the gentleman from Tennessee accept as a substitute for the amendment he now offers. My friend from Tennessee is usually very sound when it comes to spending Government money, and we are not widely apart as to the ends which he now seeks to secure, but we differ rather as to method of accomplishing those ends. If the member banks of the Federal reserve system contribute to its maintenance and to its profits, if the farmers pay the expenses of the Farm Loan Board, why can we not call on the American business man to help defray the expense for expanding and extending the service of the Foreign and Domestic Commerce Bureau? Is that unreasonable?

I have drafted an amendment in line with what Congress has approved on other appropriation bills, and if the gentleman from Tennessee will accept it in lieu of his amendment, I think the House will give approval to such method of raising necessary funds to permit the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to extend its work and field of service. Simply add after the amount which the gentleman from Tennessee seeks by his amendment to increase by \$75,000 the following language:

Plus so much of \$75,000 additional as may equal the sum of revenue derived from the sale of publications issued by the bureau and not on a sales basis when this appropriation becomes effective, and authority is hereby granted the Secretary of Commerce in his discretion to place any and all publications issued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce on a sales basis.

If this amendment is adopted, and Doctor Klein is correct, then one publication, to wit, the Foreign Buyers' List, will raise a fund of \$400,000, which is \$75,000 over the total amount carried in the five amendments proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee. This would insure the publication of documents

and lists which the business man demanded, and when such lists and publications were offered for sale to the business man, whom the hearings show have been greatly benefited by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Service, who doubts that any would hesitate to pay one dollar for publications of this importance. This would raise the amount that the gentleman from Tennessee seeks to raise without any additional charge on the Federal Treasury and without hurt to American business. This, I submit, is a fair business proposition.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman has just stated that we were represented in 40 important trade centers. Will the gentleman tell us how many important trade centers are left where we are not represented?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman well understands that there are a large number.

Mr. LAZARO. Then, why not expand?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The present bill now carries an increase of \$142,000 over the current year for this bureau, and the amendment which I suggest will provide a means to increase this to the amount which the gentleman from Tennessee deems necessary. I submit that the proposal is entirely reasonable and one that business interests served by this bureau should not complain of. I repeat again that Doctor Klein feels that one single publication of the bureau if sold at \$1 per copy would bring in \$400,000, which is far more than the amount carried in the five amendments offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. Does the gentleman think that the claim of the department, or of those in its interest, is worthy and should be granted, if they could make proper use of the money that is provided?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will be more than glad to give them the opportunity of raising the money in the way I suggest, and I think they would make wise use of the money so raised.

Mr. WINSLOW. That is not quite what I was inquiring about. I was interested to know whether the gentleman thought they had a good use for the money if it were easily obtainable?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not question but that in many foreign countries we should have agents where we now have none.

Mr. WINSLOW. And if we could arrange it in some such way as they do in the Patent Office—

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It stands to reason that if the representatives of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce have accomplished good results in the countries where they are established it should follow that they will accomplish like results in countries where we now have no representative if they are provided with funds to go there.

Mr. WINSLOW. Would the gentleman agree that if we could get the income from such a source as he proposes that the money should go to the department for proper uses?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is what the amendment which I suggested proposes, and it is my belief that every member of the committee will be willing to try it out if it is accepted by the gentleman from Tennessee as a substitute for the amendments he offers.

Now, in conclusion, this is the situation: The Budget Bureau is not infallible and does make mistakes. Our committee does not always follow the Bureau of the Budget, but we recognize that it is an important and helpful agency in providing orderly estimates for Congress to consider. In the matter of appropriations for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for the fiscal year 1926 the Bureau of the Budget granted an increase over the amount carried for the present fiscal year, and the President, I am informed, gave careful consideration to the estimates recommended by the Director of the Budget.

Our committee were further informed that it was the opinion both of the Director of the Budget and the President that the amount approved for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce was reasonable and fair and would permit the bureau not only to continue its efficient work but, with the increase granted, to expand some. The Appropriations Committee gave careful consideration to the very full and informing statements made by Secretary Hoover and Doctor Klein, and in this bill recommends, as I have stated before, an increase of \$142,000 for this bureau over the amount carried for the present fiscal year.

We must remember that there are other important agencies of the Government beside the Bureau of Foreign and Do-

mestic Commerce, and none of these agencies has been allowed the amounts which they have estimated as their needs for the fiscal year 1926. In the Department of Commerce we find that the important Bureau of Standards has not been dealt with as liberally as the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. The Bureau of Standards is one bureau that our committee, pursuing the customary course of eliciting full information as to what it was doing, and as to what amount of money it would need for its work in the next fiscal year, failed to find any express or implied demand for an increased appropriation. They had submitted, however, an estimate in excess of that allowed by the Bureau of the Budget, and in view of the very widespread and general importance of the work of this bureau I think every member of the subcommittee felt that they might need a friend in court when we come to prepare the next appropriation bill. The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce always gets a liberal allocation of any funds placed by the Director of the Budget at the disposal of the Department of Commerce for distribution over the department's various activities.

Mr. WINSLOW. I understood the gentleman to say that he thought the need of the Foreign and Domestic Commerce Bureau was apparent and meritorious.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I dislike to be quoted, especially when it seems that a wrong impression has been created.

Mr. WINSLOW. I am interested in finding out what the gentleman really thinks about my inquiry.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will be very glad to answer the gentleman's inquiry if I can.

Mr. WINSLOW. I want to get together on the original inquiry. I understood the gentleman to say that he thought the claim of the department, or the friends of the department, for an increase in appropriation was meritorious, and that they could put the money to good use if we had it to give to them. The gentleman proposes a way of raising the money with the idea that if they had it he would give it to them. Is that correct?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not care to answer the question in the categorical way that the gentleman puts it, but I will say that I think the work of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is very important and that they are rendering a splendid service. If they are now supplied with additional funds to open offices in other foreign countries, I have no doubt that good results will follow. I have suggested what I think is a proper and practical way to raise funds in excess of what this bill carries. It will place the burden for the expanded service of this bureau on the business which feels that it will be benefited from such expansion. The Government will continue to appropriate for the maintenance of this bureau more than \$3,200,000, and any excess over and above this sum that business served by this bureau desires to supply in the way suggested can be, no doubt, wisely expended by the bureau in extending its service.

Mr. WINSLOW. Let me follow with one more question. It amounts, does it not, then to this, that they could make good use of the funds if they had them, that if we had an income as large as the gentleman speaks of, he would give it to them. Those two things being settled, is it not a natural conclusion that all that we are doing by not giving the appropriation is to arrest them where they are and not let them go any farther?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I have stated several times that this bill provides a substantial increase for this bureau over the present fiscal year. No department of the Government has been given, so far as I recall, the amount which it estimated its needs to be for the fiscal year 1926.

Mr. WINSLOW. Does the gentleman know of any business man who ever called in a salesman who was selling more goods?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, we have used up more time than was expected, and it will be necessary to make another unanimous-consent request. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. MADDEN] is to speak yet, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended half an hour.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 14 minutes remaining on each side.

Mr. SHREVE. I ask that the time be extended 16 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time be extended 16 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is, 16 minutes on a side?

Mr. SHREVE. That time is for the chairman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We want the same over here.

Mr. SHREVE. We yielded time to that side in order that they might have time—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I beg pardon. I think we ought to divide the time equally. We each have 14 minutes to a side. There are several gentlemen here who want to speak, and I think the time ought to be evenly divided.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I spoke to the gentleman from Pennsylvania after speaking to the gentleman from Tennessee, and I understood there would be a request for a reasonable extension and it would be divided equally in favor of those in favor and those against. That would give the chairman the time he wishes and also give time to the opposition.

Mr. SHREVE. I amend the request and ask additional time to the extent of 30 minutes, to be divided equally between the two sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time be extended 30 additional minutes, with the understanding that one-half is to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHREVE. Will the gentleman from Alabama use some time now?

The CHAIRMAN. There will be 29 minutes to a side at the present time.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is with extreme regret that I find it impossible for me to agree with the views of my distinguished and able colleague from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] upon the proposition here presented. I recognize his ability, his conservatism, his wise investigation of the problems arising before the committee, but since my experience in Congress began, a considerable portion of the efforts that I have used here has been in connection with the promotion of our merchant marine and foreign trade, and in the investigation of subjects related to that question I have had an opportunity more intimately to acquaint myself with the proposition involved in the debate on the amendments of the gentleman from Tennessee. Therefore, believing the service and the unquestioned value not only of the present facilities afforded by existing appropriations, but also believing that there is an ample field for a wise extension of those services, I feel it to be my duty to support the amendments of the gentleman from Tennessee. [Applause.]

I was very profoundly surprised at the statement made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON], and I was more keenly surprised when I heard read the amendment which he proposed at the Clerk's desk, and which I presume he will offer later in the proceedings, the effect of which is directly to prohibit the farmers of America from enjoying any of the benefits of these appropriations in the event that this House in its wisdom should see fit to grant them. The gentleman from Iowa some months ago acquired some temporary notoriety in the country as the leader of the so-called farm bloc in this House. I presume that he still has at heart the benefits of the farmers of the country. I want to say to him that if there is any class of people in this country who are directly interested, probably more vitally interested than any other class of business, in the building up and sustaining not only of an adequate but of a permanent foreign market for our domestic products it is the farmers and cattle raisers of the country—

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I prefer not to yield right now.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I would like to ask one short question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Can the gentleman show me any data that any of these so-called attachés can bring to the benefit of the raw agricultural products that is not already available to them?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman has asked that question, and I thank the gentleman for his direct interrogatory upon this question at this point, and I will now proceed to give the gentleman the facts in the case, which I do not believe he can

successfully dispute. Doctor Klein, in testifying before this committee in reference to this particular proposition, said this:

It has been thought that our efforts are of particular significance to manufacturers—to those dealing in fabricated products. As a matter of fact, however, the largest single groups of commodities now using the service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce are farm products, foodstuffs, cotton, and tobacco. [Applause.]

These are the largest single beneficiaries of our service. That is to say, the demands or requests for help and service which we receive from dealers and producers of farm products total 208,000 in the last fiscal year.

I want the gentleman from Iowa to carry that information back to his farm constituents in the West when his views upon this question are considered.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. With all due respect to the gentleman, my time is limited.

There are some other features of this matter that I want to discuss. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] seemed very vehement this morning in criticizing the distinguished Secretary of Commerce. Those of us on this side are not responsible for the elevation of Mr. Hoover to the position he occupies. I wonder what would have been the reaction of the gentleman from Iowa regarding Mr. Hoover if he had accepted the invitation of the President of the United States to become the Secretary of Agriculture instead of retaining his post as Secretary of Commerce in the next administration? It seems that the leader of the gentleman's party and the head of the administration has a much higher idea of the capacity of Mr. Hoover than has the distinguished leader or ex-leader of the farm bloc. [Laughter and applause.]

Gentlemen, as I undertook to say before, if there is anything of profound importance to the people of this country, to the producers of this country, it is a sustained foreign market. Goods do not sell themselves in the markets of the world, especially in the foreign markets. Those who have made inquiries concerning this proposition know of the intense international rivalry that exists in all the possible fields of exploitation and markets in Europe and in South America, and in fact all over the world. Germany, Japan, England, the Scandinavian countries have in the field their numerous experts. They place their business establishments at various points for specific purposes of extending their manufacturing and trade, not only for raw materials, but for manufactured products.

It is said that the degree of our prosperity is always measured by the balance of trade favorable to us. In a large measure, economically, that is true. For one, I am not willing, gentlemen, to say that when we reach the possible maximum of \$1,000,000,000 excess of exports along that line we should be satisfied.

I believe American commerce in foreign fields has only been scratched on the surface as to some of them, and the only way American producers and manufacturers, in my opinion, are going to be able to come into full possession of the fruits of those inviting fields is to meet our competitors on the same terms and with the same instrumentalities that they use in enlarging their markets.

So I say this is not an extravagant appropriation. The Secretary of the Department of Commerce sat with the committee that reported this bill. Under the new construction of this Budget law that we passed I understand that no one has the right to utter an opinion to a committee or to Members of Congress. But the Secretary, as I say, was there, and by his presence he gave his assent to the testimony of Doctor Klein concerning the importance—the great importance—of increasing this field of activity for our foreign and domestic commerce.

I had occasion in the past summer, being a member of a select committee of the House on the Shipping Board, to visit a few of the great ports of Europe. I had occasion to come somewhat into the atmosphere of that keen rivalry where this competition is going on in foreign countries. Gentlemen, you will find that where the manufacturing and agricultural interests of America are best represented by agencies of this sort is the place where they get the most productive and profitable business. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sorry I have not more time to go into this matter more fully.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee or the gentleman from Alabama use more time?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, now that the lights are on, I can see, though rather indistinctly, the ghost of the old commerce and agriculture controversy of last spring stalking about. [Laughter.] The attitudes of my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] and my other good friend from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] make me think of a very common utterance in the Mutt and Jeff history, and so I am inclined to say, "For God's sake, be reasonable." [Laughter.]

But we do not care anything about that. There are several agricultural things which went wrong last spring, but the country still lives. We had a little matter affecting the Commerce Department which did not go quite the way some of us would have liked to have had it go. Yet we are going on and having better times.

Now, we come to this particular proposition. I believe the Committee on Appropriations has undertaken to balance its bill and to mete out proper amounts in accordance with what they think is wise, whether they prefer it otherwise or not. I have no occasion to dispute the wisdom of the particular amount which they have assigned to the Foreign Bureau of the Commerce Department, but I am interested at this time—seeing that the feeling has been running along outside of entirely smooth water—in setting the situation of that Foreign Bureau right. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] said he thought the bureau had good use for more money and he said that if we had the money easily available that could be so diverted he would be in favor of diverting it to the use of this bureau. He suggested that we might be able to sell publications of that bureau for some small sum to the people who want them. I agree in a general way with him in his conclusions or in his admissions of opinion, and I do think it is a perfectly practical thing—if the legislation can be brought about, but of that I have no knowledge—to put a price on some reports that the department gets out, and thus make an income.

I would suggest, however, that the real consideration, as it comes to this House to-day, is this: Whether or not we are justified in holding up what it seems everybody admits is the onward movement of that Foreign Bureau by failing to increase the amount by \$75,000. I said, for the lack of time and maybe the want of greater wit, that I did not know of a business house that would call in its salesmen when they were selling more goods and desired more business.

My good friend, my very good friend, my esteemed colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, said:

This department is not selling goods and we do not keep it for that purpose.

Well, technically, we do not; but I will tell you that the man who finds the place and the customers to whom my regular salesmen can sell goods is the best salesman I have. And that is what these foreign bureau representatives are doing. The history of the department and the approval of the business men of the country indicate that such is the fact.

The only question we have, my friends, is this—and I am not bucking the committee and I am not particularly urging on the side of those who want more money, although I have my own views and I know how I shall vote—shall we, for the sake of \$75,000, hold up a department, which we all admit is doing a real work in building up the foundations of business from which we get our national income, and fail to give it that extra amount of money? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BRAND].

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this plan of selling the pamphlets of the Government or of the Department of Commerce is absolutely new to my mind, and I think it would involve the consideration of selling other pamphlets, agricultural pamphlets, and so forth. We are spending about \$3,000,000 a year in securing the information that goes into the pamphlets issued by the Department of Commerce. That is the total expense of this bureau, and a good deal of it is involved in securing the information and publishing it. The value of this work comes from the number of people who take these pamphlets, see them and read them, and if we should start in to sell these pamphlets would we not reduce the number of people who would see them in this country? If these pamphlets were to be sold to them for so much a year, would we not reduce the use of those pamphlets and thereby reduce the value of the \$3,000,000 we are spending in securing the information?

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Government should not have some remuneration or something coming back from the men who get the private benefit of the work done by this bureau?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I believe it will do more good if we give this information freely than if we sell it, just as we do the farm bulletins, and so forth.

I am interested in this question particularly because I spent three months in Europe this past summer. I found I did not take interest very long in the ruins over in Europe, but I found very soon that I took interest not in what Europe has but in what Europe lacks, and the place to study that question I found to be not among the ruins of Europe but right in the offices of the commercial attachés representing the Department of Commerce of the United States, and I found myself most of my time over there, while I was in London, Paris, Rome, and Athens, right in those offices.

Now, I have but a short time and I want to give you an idea of the possibilities of business over there. If you go out and order a taxi, the chances are you will get a Ford, and going down the street in the taxi you will see three or four other makes of American machines; but in all of Europe there are only as many automobiles as there are now in the State of Ohio, but in the next 10 or 15 years you are going to see Europe using automobiles just as America does. We have the opportunity to sell those automobiles because we are in on the ground floor and we can make them cheaper than they can over there. Now, as to telephones, I found in southern Europe that they had mighty poor telephone service from France on down south.

I found out that if you wanted to make a long-distance call in southern Europe you had to go to the station and make an engagement for the next day. You would have to wait 24 hours before you could have a long-distance call supplied. I found also in Spain that the telephone service was bad, and the American Telephone Co. has made a contract covering \$90,000,000 for an entirely new service in Spain, and they are now trying to get contracts in all the other countries of southern Europe at this very time.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will yield, what did this organization have to do with that?

Mr. BRAND of Ohio. I will answer the gentleman from Illinois by saying that while I was in Athens I met there a number of engineers—waterworks engineers—who were trying to get the Government to establish a new water plant in Athens. The water plant in Athens was built 1,600 years ago, and they need a new one. [Laughter.] They do not use much water inside or out in Europe, but they are thinking seriously of putting in a new plant in Athens, and the engineers from America were there, and I met them in the offices of the attaché, and while I was there the contracts were made. [Applause.]

I will say further to the gentleman from Illinois that while I was in Athens the Government of England furnished the Greek Government with \$10,000,000 to help the refugees from Turkey residing in Greece. And a part of the fund was made available for horses and cows, so that the refugees could establish themselves on farm land. Horses and cows are higher in Greece than in the United States, and the day this fund was made available I saw an American commercial attaché cable New Orleans, St. Louis, and cow territory in New York for prices on cows and horses, and this led to big business. Would we ever have known of this demand in Greece for our animals if we had had no commercial attaché in Greece?

My experience in Europe makes me know that these representatives of the Department of Commerce are a great asset to American business, and I will vote to-day for three more to be located at once. It will not be many years until the United States is using all the agricultural products we produce, and then we will depend entirely upon industrial products to maintain the balance of trade, and we must get ready for that situation now.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEARY].

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, three minutes is not very long, but as none of my distinguished colleagues who are orators from the great city of New York are present, I thought I ought to say a word in favor of an amendment of this kind that will increase the entire commerce of this country. [Applause.]

Commerce, of course, is what built up the great city I come from. It is the thing I have been interested in since a boy.

Forty-five years ago when I came to New York we had in the Borough of Brooklyn one-half a million people and to-day we have 2,000,000 or more in just that one borough. What created that? Commerce. On the great docks we have spent millions, and I think I may say billions of dollars, and yet we are hesitating and arguing and using a tremendous amount of eloquence and learning discussing a little matter of \$75,000 that some great merchant would not hesitate to spend in advertising for himself. [Applause.] It seems to me it is ridiculous.

What does commerce do? It is said that my great city is not only the greatest commercial city in the country and perhaps in the world but is also the greatest manufacturing city, and we should think of the employment of people in all directions, including the workmen in the factories, the men on the docks, and the men on the boats, and then we would realize what commerce means. We should not hesitate about a little matter of this kind which, it is said by those who know, will give us an opportunity to increase our commerce, which means the welfare of the country. This all goes back to the agriculturist, to the commercial men, to the clerks, and to all of our employees, and yet we hesitate over a small amount like this. Of course, this gives an opportunity for our orators to practice a little elocution, but when you come down to the real facts in the case I know that the wisdom of this great Congress will not show itself so shortsighted and so stupid, I might say, as to vote down the small increase that is requested in the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McSWEENEY].

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I presume to come here to-day because I am making an ardent effort to arrive at what is really an expenditure and what is really an investment on the part of our Government.

I do not want your penury to mock the noble efforts of our country to extend its rights. I do not wish our Government to in any way be paternal in taking care of the industries of America, but as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I am earnestly trying in some way to help the farmer, and even though the Committee on Agriculture probably is not a unit behind this measure, nevertheless there are certain sections where the Department of Commerce can help the agriculturalists and help to sell the products of the agriculturalists abroad, and that is, indeed, a thing we should strive for if we are truly the friend of those people.

I am hoping that American trade, as Richelieu said of the French trade, that calm health of nations which fills a sail can carry our products and by carrying our products establish a friendly relationship with all these countries.

You heard it referred to by our good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] that many of the great business men probably would be against this measure, but we must realize that these larger businesses probably be so because of the great growth they have experienced and are able to maintain their own men in foreign ports. We realize that the Standard Oil Co. and other large companies are able to have under their private guidance men to take care of their foreign interests, but to-day my interest lies not with the big industries so much as with the smaller industries that can not maintain a foreign representative, and for whom the Government of the United States should maintain some representation abroad and give them an opportunity to bid in the field of competition with equal opportunity with the greater and larger industries.

We realize the boastfulness of Rudyard Kipling when he said:

You can take the wings of the morning,
Sail around the world 'til you are dead;
But you can't get away from the tune that they play,
To the blooming old rag overhead.

That is boastfulness but it is actuated probably by his patriotism, and I hope I may be equally patriotic, but probably a little bit boastful, and paraphrase him and say:

You can take the wings of the morning,
Sail around the world 'til we are dead,
And find no forward movement in all the world
Without an American at its head.

I feel if we do that we will be doing the thing America would have us do and the thing that will make us prominent in all parts of the world.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, first let me apologize to the committee for inflicting myself upon it again. I shall use the three minutes to call attention to the fact that there are five amendments pending. Many of those who have spoken have referred to these amendments as relating to commercial attachés. One amendment does increase the attaché appropriation. Other amendments increase the funds provided for the extension of our foreign commerce in Europe, in Central and South America, and in the Far East. I have not the time to do more than to read to you what Doctor Klein says with reference to the European situation, for instance:

The European situation alone has almost doubled the burden of the organization, and how we are going to meet that with an increase in our funds of 2½ per cent I do not know.

Let me read to you what he says about Latin America:

We are being swamped with requests for more service in the field of Latin America. There is no field in which our department is being more used. It is a field where we will have the stiffest European competition. The best index of that is the fact that for the first three or four months of this fiscal year the demands for service are running at the rate of 112 per cent over last year. That is an index of the growing interest in Latin America. And that interest is spread all over the country—quite as much in the Western, Southern, and Gulf States as in the Atlantic seaboard States.

This is a proposition not to help big business, because big business can take care of itself. The big business, which has millions of dollars of capital, can send its representatives to Europe and can take care of itself, but this is to help the manufacturer and the farmer in your State and in mine who has not the funds at his command to send representatives abroad to represent him in the various countries of Europe. They are being benefited by this great service, and I appeal to you to vote for all of these amendments. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, these amendments involve the sum of \$390,000, and I think the full committee should hear the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I therefore make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty Members present, a quorum.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 29 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will give me as good attention as it has given to the other speakers. I have been delighted to watch the interest that the Members have taken in the debate this afternoon.

For several days past I have been receiving telegrams asking me to support the Byrns amendment to the commerce bill and to cooperate with him. Like all propaganda telegrams, they are vague and indefinite as to what the amendments are. The sender had been told by some bureaucratic booster to send these telegrams to the Members of Congress. I am always glad to cooperate with the gentleman from Tennessee, my coworker and constant companion in resisting raids on the Treasury, and so when I got these communications I very naturally assumed that according to his past performance and true to the traditional policies of his historic party, he had planned a program to reduce some expenditure of the Government and had interested the taxpaying public in his motion to the extent of soliciting support.

The gentleman from Tennessee has been a wonderful aid in that direction, and I find myself under very great obligations to him for his constant cooperation in the work in which this splendid committee over which I preside has been engaged. There is no man in the House or in the country for whom I have greater admiration, and I should be very happy, indeed, if I could find myself in a position to cooperate with him on the amendment which he has pending, but I can not find myself consistently able to do so.

My disillusionment as to his intent was soon dispelled. These telegrams became so numerous and from so varied sources that the real situation dawned upon me and I was amazed at my own stupidity! A propaganda barrage has been laid down on Congress. The bureaucratic boosters have been busy with their insidious efforts to get more funds for their pet activity.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman that I have not received any telegram and that I am not responsible for any telegrams.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I know the gentleman is not responsible for the barrage and that he has not received any telegrams. It was not necessary that he should, because he is leading the charge on the Treasury and these telegrams were intended to support the charge. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I, too, have received several telegrams urging my support of this increase, all based upon the definite assertion that the Secretary of Commerce had officially requested this increase. I have also heard a number of gentlemen on the floor to-day base their argument in favor of an increase on the fact that Secretary Hoover has asked for it. Is that the fact?

Mr. MADDEN. There has been no request made by Secretary Hoover or anybody else in his behalf for any appropriation in addition to what we carry in the bill. It is true that Doctor Klein, the head of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, has been before the committee, and he said in almost every line of his testimony that many requests have been made upon the bureau for greater activities, which they would be able to comply with if they had more money.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Was the Secretary of Commerce present when Doctor Klein made those representations as to the needs of the bureau?

Mr. MADDEN. He did not make any representations as to specific needs of the bureau. He simply made a general statement to the effect that he could comply with some requests if he had more money.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Was the Secretary present when he made these wild statements?

Mr. MADDEN. He was not.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. If he will read the hearings, he will see that Secretary Hoover injected some remarks.

Mr. SHREVE. Secretary Hoover was present for a short time.

Mr. MADDEN. He was not present during all of the statements made by Doctor Klein?

Mr. SHREVE. No.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, these telegrams come from all sources. A Member of Congress has received one asking him to support the Byrns amendment to provide for a representative abroad for motion pictures! Shades of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson! Is my friend willing to inject a bureau of the Government into a program of sending paid agents of the United States into foreign countries to sell the movies to them? If I thought that by so doing, we in this land might be spared from some of the scenes that the cinema portrays I might be impelled by a sense of self-protection to vote for his amendment and send them abroad. I would not by my vote, however, wish to have a paid representative of the Government of the United States urging upon the public of foreign lands the purchase of those films that are misrepresentative of true American life. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows I am not, and I am quite sure the gentleman is satisfied that any increase made in this for the purpose I have indicated would not be so used.

Mr. MADDEN. I am only reciting what is stated in the telegrams.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, well.

Mr. MADDEN. I am only reciting what is stated in the telegrams.

What is behind this propaganda, and where does it come from? The answer is simple. The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce is in this bill. They have received an increase of \$92,000 in this measure over what they have for the current year, and if we eliminate from consideration the decrease of \$50,000 in the item for crude-rubber investigations, a temporary proposition, the increase over 1925 for the continuing, constant, regular work of the bureau is \$142,000. They are not happy with an increase of only \$142,000. They presented their needs to the committee and did not get what they thought they ought to have. So they determined that they would bombard Congress with propaganda. They are seeking

to get their funds increased by influencing the Members of the House through the sources from which these telegrams come. They rely upon the influence which they believe that the name of the sender of the telegram will have with the man to whom it is sent. The wires are all of the same kind. The tenor of them indicates that the person who sent them does not know what it is all about. He has been adroitly told by some one that if he does this it will help his business. He does not know the facts.

If he is a business man, he is a stalwart believer in tax reduction, but does not stop to think that when he sends telegrams to his Congressman to increase some Government bureau that he is virtually asking the postponement of some part of tax reduction every time he sends such a wire.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Would it interfere with the gentleman if I asked a question?

Mr. MADDEN. I would rather go on for the time being.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It will only take about a quarter of a minute to say that I have inquired on this side of the House and have been unable to find, up to this time, but one gentleman who has received any such telegram as that to which the gentleman has alluded.

Mr. MADDEN. Then they have been sending them on this side of the House. They have been sending them to Members of the House; they have been sending them to Senators and asking them to join Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee in the passing of a plan to increase the appropriation.

I ask Members of this House not to be misled by this barrage. Most of the men who send these telegrams do not know what this bureau is receiving in the way of Federal appropriations now. It has been dealt with generously in the past.

In the time that has been allotted to me I want briefly to trace its origin and the growth of the appropriations to support it. When you know what it has received and what it is now receiving, I believe you will agree with the committee that these amendments that are proposed should not prevail.

All I think you have to do is to know the facts, and I am going to try to give them to you. I have no prejudice; I am as much interested in the development of foreign commerce as any man in the United States; but I am also interested in the running of the Government on an economical, systematic, non-extravagant basis.

The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce was created by the consolidation of the Bureau of Manufactures and the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and the transfer of certain duties which had been given to the Bureau of Labor. The consolidation was made in the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year 1913, approved August 23, 1912.

The first appropriation for the bureau as newly created and designated was for the fiscal year 1913 in the sum of \$174,860. By the fiscal year 1920 this sum had been increased to \$1,085,460. This took place during the years of Democratic control in the House. The increase over that period resulted in an average yearly increase of approximately \$130,000. For the fiscal years 1921 to date the appropriations have been made under Republican control in the House. During that time the appropriations for this bureau have increased from \$1,085,460 to the amount recommended in this bill of \$3,207,000. This latter sum includes \$183,000 allotted from the printing fund, \$105,000 from the contingent fund, and \$2,919,004 granted directly to the bureau. The increase from the fiscal year 1920 of \$1,085,460 to \$3,207,004 for the next year is \$2,121,544. The increase during this last period is an average yearly increase of \$353,600.

Have we starved it? Do you think the business people of the country are going to demand appropriations if they understood the facts, and do you think they will sustain you in making these additional appropriations when they do understand the facts, even though they may send you telegrams demanding you vote for increased appropriations for something about which they do not know the details?

These figures are cited to show that the belief that seems to be current that the Government is not doing well by this service is not well founded. I doubt if there is a bureau of the Government which has been so generously treated by way of increased appropriations so consistently as has this one.

I want now to call attention to the organization which has been provided for the bureau in the department in Washington, in district offices throughout the United States, and in various places in foreign countries.

The bureau organization in Washington, as estimated for the next fiscal year, calls for annual aggregate salaries of \$1,248,872, and the number of persons to be employed is 604. The Washington pay roll is approximately 40 per cent of the total

appropriations of the bureau for the fiscal year 1926. Out of this Washington pay roll there are 87 provided at salaries in excess of \$3,000 a year. They are as follows:

\$6,000 or over.....	4
\$5,000 to \$6,000.....	28
\$4,000 to \$5,000.....	20
\$3,000 to \$4,000.....	35
Total.....	87

The organization in the United States, outside of the department in Washington, consists of the following:

Ten branch offices, one each at Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Detroit, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco, and Seattle. One additional is provided in this bill for Portland, Oreg. The managers of these branch offices receive salaries ranging from \$3,800 to \$5,200 per annum, and assistant managers—four in number—receive \$3,000. The total of employees in branch offices in the United States is 92, and the total cost \$230,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Of course, the gentleman understands my amendment does not relate to district officers, and the committee itself recommended the increase of the district office of \$15,000 at Portland.

Mr. MADDEN. The foreign service consists of offices in 40 foreign cities, headed either by commercial attachés or trade commissioners. In the foreign service there are 317 officers and employees, as follows:

Commercial attachés, salaries \$6,000 to \$9,000.....	16
Trade commissioners, salaries \$4,000 to \$7,000.....	41
Assistant trade commissioners, salaries \$3,000 to \$5,000.....	32
American clerks, \$2,000 to \$3,000.....	21
Native employees.....	207
Total.....	317

There was transferred by law from the Customs Service to this bureau the compilation of statistics in connection with customs, and the bureau maintains at New York the statistical division with 170 employees and a pay roll of over \$250,000.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I think the impression is that these men here in Washington are not handling foreign matters.

Mr. MADDEN. They do handle them, of course.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS. Does the gentleman think the amount expended in Washington is excessive?

Mr. MADDEN. I do.

Mr. MILLS. Then, why was it not cut?

Mr. MADDEN. We can not regulate that very well. We try to as best we can, but it is largely an administrative matter.

The approximate division of the appropriation of \$3,207,000 in the pending bill for 1926, and the distribution of the 1,183 employees thereunder, are as follows:

Object	Amount	Number employees
Departments in Washington:		
Salaries.....	\$1,250,000	604
Contingent expenses.....	105,000	
Printing.....	183,000	
Total.....	1,538,000	604
Offices in foreign countries.....	1,040,000	317
District offices in the United States outside of Washington.....	230,000	92
Statistical bureau at New York.....	340,000	170
General travelling expenses.....	59,000	
Grand total.....	3,207,000	1,183

I want to tell what the bureau has had in the way of appropriations commencing with the fiscal year 1920:

1920.....	\$1,085,460
1921.....	1,136,533
1922.....	1,451,211
1923.....	1,925,395
1924.....	3,056,314
1925.....	3,115,303
1926 (this bill).....	3,207,000

Included in the appropriations for the fiscal year 1924 was \$400,000 for the crude-rubber investigations, a temporary activity. This sum was reduced for 1925 to \$94,000 and to \$50,000 for 1926. The reduction in this one item made possible increases in other regular items and therefore the increases of

1925 over 1924 and 1926 over 1925 do not show as large as they practically were. The real increase of 1925 over 1924 was approximately \$375,000, and the increase of 1926 over 1925 is approximately \$140,000.

These figures show that Congress has been liberal with this bureau each year. It is true that the proportionate increase for 1926 is not so large as it has been in some of the past years.

The increases in years gone by were generous, the bureau was new, and an organization needed. The time has come when we should take stock of what we are doing in the way of expansion. If you listen attentively and heed to the last dollar the requests of the propagandists, there is no limit to which we can go in bedecking every important geographical point in the world with paid agents of the United States.

This is not the only bureau or department of the Government engaged in work abroad which is beneficial to the products of the United States. At the last session of Congress there was enacted what is known as the Rogers Act to give a better status and a greater impetus to the activities of the State Department in foreign fields. That act established what is known as the corps of foreign-service officers. There are 642 of them. Appropriations for them and for the Foreign Service of the State Department are carried in this bill. Another bill passed the House at the last session of Congress authorizing the Department of Agriculture to have agents abroad to further the interest of the agricultural and forest products of the United States. It is now pending on the Senate Calendar by report from the Senate committee. The Department of Agriculture has a small number of men now in foreign fields engaged in economic work.

How far are we to go in the foreign field with these different agencies of the Government? Thus far, we are told by them, that there is no duplication, that they are working harmoniously, that there is no jealousy of one for the work of the other. I hope heartily that this is the fact, and that the difficulties of the past have been ironed out and the problems adjusted. I tell you frankly that if these proposed appropriations are added to this bill, there is a likelihood that whatever of calm exists among the different activities in the foreign field may be upset and the jealous rivalry again aroused.

I do not wish anyone to infer that I do not believe in the expansion of our foreign commerce or in the Government giving aid to that expansion. We should, of course, expand to the markets of the world wherever we can. The Government should aid that expansion reasonably, sanely, and in the most careful fashion. I do not conceive it to be the function or duty of the Government to send its agents out to procure specific contracts or to make specific sales for American exporters. It should furnish them with general information about the markets of the world and stop there.

There is one phase in connection with procuring foreign trade that should not be overlooked. It is well to compete with other nations. It is not well to carry our competition to a basis where we beget more than friendly rivalry. We should be exceedingly careful about the manner in which we load up with appropriations those bureaus of the Government which are to represent us in foreign territory. That phase of expansion of Federal activities should be most carefully, cautiously, and sanely considered from every angle of approach. The mere statement on the part of some bureau chief or the receipt of stereotyped "inspired" telegrams and letters asking for the support of some motion projected to increase the operations of a given bureau should not be sufficient cause to increase the appropriations for a given activity operating in the delicate atmosphere of foreign relations without any consideration of the merits of those other activities of the Government which are engaged in the same sphere of action.

In my opinion there is great opportunity for the legislative study of two services in which there might be national danger from the overlapping of zealous effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the committee yield me five additional minutes? Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that they may. I will conclude then.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. I refer to the land-border patrols of the United States, where the Customs Service, Immigration Service, and Prohibition Service, and perhaps some others, are at work on their individual problems. It might be that a special legislative committee of the House should be appointed to harmonize the differences of the various activities and result in the estab-

lishment of a border-patrol service to handle all of the problems at a lessened cost and increased efficiency. So, too, with our foreign service. Expansion of the three authorized agencies in the foreign field—namely, State, Agriculture, and Commerce—if not now actually resulting in service duplication or jealousies, is certain, with sufficient expansion of any or all of them, to result in lack of harmony, consequent ineffectiveness, and perhaps other more far-reaching consequences. It may not be altogether practicable, but if special legislative attention could be directed toward the enactment of law which would place these three services in the foreign field under a unified control, with definite limits and bounds, the efforts of the Federal agencies in that direction would give the confidence which comes from definite responsibility in work which is the most serious the Nation has—our foreign relations.

There is one other phase of the matter so far as the demand for increased appropriations for this particular purpose is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I regret I have not the time. Otherwise I would yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What is the aggregate amount involved?

Mr. MADDEN. Three hundred and fifteen thousand dollars, I think. It is not a question of the particular amount of money involved, but a question of principle.

On every tongue we hear commendation for tax reduction and reduction or restraint in Government expenditures from which tax reduction results. Everyone with general acclaim favors restraint or reduction in expenditures, but when we come to be specific and apply the reduction or exercise the restraint the most ingenious arguments are concocted and advanced as to why the reduction or restraint ought not to be applied to the particular activity or enterprise in question, but should be applied to some other activity or enterprise of the Government. When we yield to the special pleading of a specific cause and shift the reduction or restraint to the other activity, the proponents of that activity have the same argument and suggestion for a shifting of the reduction or restraint still further on to some other place. When we speak generally of tax reduction and reduction or restraint in expenditures, everyone favors it; but when we come to be specific and try to hold in check the activities of the Government that want to burst their bounds and spread in all directions we are always met with the statement that this specific activity is the most meritorious thing in the whole Government service, and that unless we grant what its ardent and enthusiastic supporters want the heavens will fall and the Nation go into a slump.

One of the most frequently used arguments in connection with the reduction of taxes is the statement that there is no single act of the Government more salutary to the prosperity of the industry of the United States in its most comprehensive phase than the reduction of taxes. That is an economic fact that all will acknowledge. Yet we are met here in this debate with the oft-repeated assertion that the export trade in the United States is contingent upon increasing these appropriations. I can not reconcile these arguments. Reduction or restraint in expenditure and tax reduction go hand in hand. Increased expenditure and tax reduction do not harmonize.

Now, the problem is a simple one. Are we here to be swayed by these telegrams that ask funds beyond the increase that has already been allowed? Are we to be influenced by these general arguments advanced by the proponents of this cause as to the increase in business? Are we to be guided by sanity and moderation in the growth of Government bureaus, or are we to give them ad libitum the funds they say they want and then trust to luck that we have not authorized the doing of things we do not approve? I believe the \$3,207,000 in this bill is sufficient, including, as it does, an increase of over \$140,000, compared with the regular work of the current year.

I hope the committee will not adopt the amendments. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the situation. There is one amendment pending. The others will be offered for the information of the House. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 50, line 11, strike out the figures "\$315,861," and insert "\$390,861."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and on a division, suggested by the Chairman, there were—ayes 65, noes 81.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. SHREVE and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 71, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Promoting commerce, Europe and other areas: For all necessary expenses, including investigations in Europe and other areas, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding, and computing machines, accessories and repairs, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, maps, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, newspapers (both foreign and domestic) not exceeding \$400, and all other publications for the promotion of the commercial interests of the United States, rent outside the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, and all other incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, to further promote and develop the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, \$432,600, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided*, That not more than \$53,000 of the foregoing sum may be used for personal services in Washington, D. C.: *Provided further*, That not more than four trade commissioners employed under this appropriation may be recalled from their foreign posts and assigned to duty in the Department of Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered to this paragraph by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 51, lines 4 and 6, strike out the figures "\$432,600" and "\$53,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$492,600" and "\$75,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Promoting commerce, South and Central America: To further promote and develop the commerce of the United States with South and Central America, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding and computing machines, accessories and repairs, books of reference and periodicals, reports, plans, specifications, manuscripts, documents, maps, newspapers (both foreign and domestic) not exceeding \$400, and all other publications, rent outside of the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, and all other incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, \$248,040, of which amount not to exceed \$99,080 may be expended for personal service in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not more than two trade commissioners employed under this appropriation may be recalled from their foreign posts and assigned to duty in the Department of Commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to this paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 52, line 14, strike out the figures "\$248,040" and "\$99,080" and insert the figures "\$308,040" and "\$120,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Promoting commerce in the Far East: To further promote and develop the commerce of the United States with the Far East, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase

of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding and computing machines, accessories and repairs, books of reference and periodicals, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, maps, newspapers (both foreign and domestic) not exceeding \$400, and all other publications, rent outside of the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, and all other incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, \$243,734, of which amount not to exceed \$95,771 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not more than two trade commissioners employed under this appropriation may be recalled from their foreign posts and assigned to duty in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph because it is legislation not authorized on an appropriation bill. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania will admit it is legislation. There is no organic law that authorizes it.

Mr. SHREVE. This matter has been passed on a number of times in previous Congresses, when the same question has been considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the real question is whether it is authorized by law or not. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that it is legislation not authorized by law. What has the gentleman from Pennsylvania to say about that?

Mr. SHREVE. It is this way: It was authorized under the general organic law which created the department, and we argued it a couple of years ago. The Chair then overruled the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to be heard, Mr. Chairman. There is no legislative authority that authorizes this appropriation of \$243,734. This bureau is not authorized by law. This bureau originated in 1913 on an appropriation bill. There were two bureaus which had been carried in appropriation acts that were consolidated, and certain services were taken out of the Department of Labor that had been carried in appropriation acts, and on an appropriation bill there was an attempt to create this bureau. It was not organic law and there was no legislation authorizing it. It has been set up by riders on appropriation bills, and I challenge the gentleman from Pennsylvania to show one single legislative act that ever authorized this service in the Far East. He can not do it.

Mr. SHREVE. I repeat again, Mr. Chairman, that the matter has been disposed of on several occasions, and it rests entirely upon the organic law on which the bureau was founded, and that gives the Department of Commerce the right to do this character of work.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman the organic law?

Mr. SHREVE. I will have it in a minute.

Mr. BLANTON. The burden is on the gentleman from Pennsylvania to show that the organic act authorizes this particular bureau, and he can not do it.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, you will find the law in Barnes's Federal Code on page 157. It refers to the Department of Commerce, and the Chair will find this in the first section:

There shall be at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Commerce and Labor and a Secretary of Commerce and Labor who shall be the head thereof, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Then it provides for the salary of the Secretary. I follow the language along down and find:

There shall be in said department an Assistant Secretary—

And so forth. Now we come to the powers and duties of the department as defined in section 670:

It shall be the province and duty of said department to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, the mining, manufacturing, shipping, and fishery industries.

That is where we find the authority under the organic act.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, under that general authority there is no authority for this particular bureau within the department or for us to have trade commissioners in China or Japan unless specific authority is given by law. There is no authority under that organic act read by the gentleman creating the Department of Commerce and Labor which gives the Secretary of Commerce the authority to establish this bureau and to send commercial attachés to China or Japan. There is no authority given under that organic act for these various services to be performed under this paragraph. All that must be done by legislative acts. I know that there is a ruling to

that effect made by the former Representative from Kansas, Mr. Campbell, but such ruling was made through expediency and not based on decisions of the former chairman, and should not be followed.

I have not raised a point of order against the other paragraphs affecting this bureau because I think they may have enough merit in them to be productive of good, though they too are unauthorized, but we should not enlarge the services of this department just now. After a few years when our Nation gets back on its feet again financially we will try to arrange so that every time our friend from California [Mr. MACLAFFERTY] goes back to Shanghai again he shall find there an American commercial attaché at the dock to welcome him and to introduce him around; and so that when our distinguished friend from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT] goes back to Singapore again he shall find there an American commercial attaché at the dock to welcome him and to show him around and introduce him. That seemingly is what they expect. This organic act never contemplated that all of that was to be done for our friend from California and our friend from New York. It is legislation pure and simple, unauthorized on an appropriation bill and ought to come off.

Mr. SHREVE. At the time this matter was considered before I think the gentleman from Texas made a point of order against this paragraph or against the paragraph providing for commercial attachés. However, it matters not to which paragraph he refers, because it is all under the organic law which provides for the promotion of commerce, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. It seems from a reading of the organic law that it is provided that the bureau can carry on these general activities at various places. The Chair finds a direct ruling by Chairman Campbell on March 24, 1921, when the gentleman from Texas made the same point of order, and the Chair at that time overruled his point of order. The point of order is overruled at the present time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Page 53, lines 7 and 8, strike out the figures "\$243,734" and the figures "\$95,771," and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$303,734" and the figures "\$115,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Export industries: To enable the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to investigate and report on domestic as well as foreign problems relating to the production, distribution, and marketing in so far as they relate to the important export industries of the United States, including personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed \$575,404, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding and computing machines, accessories and repairs, books of reference and periodicals, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, and all other publications, rent outside District of Columbia, and all other incidental expenses connected therewith, \$618,054.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 54, line 7, strike out the figures "\$575,404" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$635,404"; and in line 14 strike out the figures "\$618,054" and insert in lieu thereof "\$678,054."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Domestic commerce and raw-materials investigations: For all expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding and computing machines, accessories and repairs, medical supplies and first-aid outfits, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, and all other publications, rent outside of the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, and all other incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, to enable the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to collect and compile information regarding the disposition and handling of raw materials and

manufactures within the United States; and to investigate the conditions of production and marketing of foreign raw materials essential for American industries, \$115,000, of which amount not to exceed \$100,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: On page 55, line 5, after the word "industries," strike out "\$115,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000" and add the following: "Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used for collecting and compiling information regarding the disposition and handling of or to investigate the conditions of production and marketing of raw agricultural products in the United States or in foreign countries."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 18, noes 34.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Investigation of foreign trade restrictions: For all necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding, and computing machines, accessories and repairs, books of reference and periodicals, reports, documents, plans, specifications, manuscripts, and all other publications, rent outside of the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, and all other incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, to enable the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to collect and compile information regarding the restrictions and regulations of trade imposed by foreign countries, \$30,000, of which amount not to exceed \$29,500 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now arise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SNELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 11753, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce and Labor, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia, for three days, on account of important business.

Mr. DOYLE, for two days, on account of important business.

Mr. HOCH (at the request of Mr. WHITE of Kansas) for two days, on account of sickness.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RAILROADS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the report of the Director General of Railroads and agent of the President for the year ended December 31, 1924, together with his final report as to adjustments of the claims of carriers whose property was taken over and actually operated by the Government during the 26 months of Federal control.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1925.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

S. 1656. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the La Plata River compact;

S. 3036. An act to amend the law relating to timber operations on the Menominee Reservation in Wisconsin;

S. 3792. An act to amend section 81 of the Judicial Code; and S. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution authorizing the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau to grant a right of way over United States Veterans' Bureau hospital reservation at Knoxville, Iowa.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for the information of some Members who have made inquiry, may I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] when he expects to call up the rule sending the Muscle Shoals bill to conference?

Mr. SNELL. I had intended to bring it up to-morrow, but I think now, on account of some requests that have been made, it will not be brought up until Tuesday, unless something now unforeseen happens.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 24, 1925, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

812. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of schedules and lists of papers and documents on the files of the Treasury Department which are no longer needed in the transaction of public business and have no permanent value; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

813. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, for the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, amounting to \$1,728,000 (H. Doc. No. 571); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

814. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, for refunds of immigration fines erroneously assessed and collected, amounting to \$2,110 (H. Doc. No. 572); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

815. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, for the Alaska Railroad, amounting to \$300,000 (H. Doc. No. 573); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

816. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$215.90 to pay claims which he has adjusted and which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. 574); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

817. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Mill Cut and Clubfoot Creek, N. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 407. A resolution for the consideration of H. R. 518; without amendment (Rept. No. 1269). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 412. A resolution to provide for an investigation of the National Disabled Soldiers' League (Inc.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1270). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RATHBONE: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 10348. A bill authorizing the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army to accept a certain tract of land from Mrs. Anne Archbold, donated to the United States for park purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ZIHLMAN: Committee on District of Columbia. H. R. 596. A bill to provide for the extension of Bancroft Place between Phelps Place and Twenty-third Street NW., and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DYER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4202. A bill to amend section 5908, United States Compiled Statutes, 1916 (R. S., sec. 3186, as amended by act of March 1, 1879, ch. 125, sec. 3, and act of March 4, 1913, ch. 166); without amendment (Rept. No. 1273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MORROW: A bill (H. R. 11883) to provide for the enlargement of the present public building at Raton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 11884) to establish home ports of vessels of the United States, to validate documents relating to such vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11885) granting certain lands and reserving other lands as a source of water supply for the cities and towns in the Willamette Valley, in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11886) to amend section 7 of an act entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. p. 961); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 11887) authorizing issuance of certificates of identification to alien residents of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 11888) granting the consent of Congress to John Bates, Fred Hulén, and A. Shattuck and their assigns, of Duncan, Stephens County, Okla., to construct a bridge across the Red River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 11889) authorizing increases in the commissioned personnel of the Regular Army to provide additional instructors for the National Guard, Officers' Reserve Corps, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and citizens military training camps, and to increase the efficiency of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11890) to enlarge and extend the post-office building at Battle Creek, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 11891) to authorize the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in California and the surrounding States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 328) to provide for designating the route of the Old Oregon Trail; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. JARRETT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 329) authorizing an investigation of the proposed Molokai Irrigation project, county of Maui, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. SMITH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 330) to authorize the appropriation of certain amounts for the Yuma irrigation project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. PARK of Georgia: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 42) authorizing the payment to Hampton V. Ricks of \$1,440 as messenger to the Joint Committee on Revision of the Laws in the Sixtieth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. STEVENSON: Resolution (H. Res. 413) requiring the Postmaster General to transmit to the House of Representatives the report of Hon. John T. Doyle and Mr. Neiss on the sale of Federal patronage by Joseph W. Talbert and his subordinates in South Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, urging passage of the Gooding bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 11892) granting an increase of pension to Seffie B. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEEDY: A bill (H. R. 11893) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11894) granting a pension to Raymond R. Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 11895) for the relief of W. D. Wilson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 11896) granting a pension to Henry C. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 11897) granting a pension to Lucy Bowers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 11898) granting a pension to Catherine Trushel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 11899) granting a pension to Laomi Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 11900) for the relief of J. M. Holladay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 11901) granting a pension to Lizzie Forkey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11902) granting an increase of pension to Montine C. Gordon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL: A bill (H. R. 11903) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 11904) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11905) granting an increase of pension to Mary Brownfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 11906) granting a pension to Stephen Dorsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 11907) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca B. Nowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 11908) granting an increase of pension to Emma Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 11909) granting an increase of pension to Mary Hare Mason; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 11910) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia Kenfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 11911) granting an increase of pension to Rosina Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11912) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia L. Piercy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 11913) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. DeCoursey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11914) granting a pension to Francis M. Hamon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11915) granting a pension to Henry B. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11916) granting an increase of pension to Susan Sigler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 11917) granting a pension to Nelson E. Bucknam; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 11918) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11919) granting an increase of pension to Isabella F. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3514. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of City Council of Boston, Mass., James Donovan, city clerk, recommending early and favorable consideration of Senate bill 3674, providing for an increase in the salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3515. By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petitions of various citizens of Clarke and Cowlitz Counties, Wash., opposing the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3516. By Mr. KELLER: Petition of sundry citizens of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the enactment of the Sunday

observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3517. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 68 residents of Sonoma, Calif., in protest against the pending compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3518. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of the Botanical Society of America, regarding a proposed national arboretum; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3519. By Mr. MANLOVE: Petition of sundry citizens of cities in the fifteenth congressional district in the State of Missouri, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3218, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3520. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Courts Committee of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Graham bill (H. R. 5195), which would extend the probation system to the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3521. By Mr. PHILLIPS: Petition of the Woman's Club of Ambridge, Pa., urging the adoption of the resolution providing for the creation of the World Court, and recommending that it be reported out of committee and placed upon the Senate calendar for action at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3522. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Oakland Chamber of Commerce, Oakland, Calif.; Building Owners & Managers' Association of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.; E. A. Bridgford, attorney at law, San Francisco, Calif.; and Merchants' Exchange (Inc.), of San Francisco, Calif., all protesting against the passage of the Ball rent act making the District of Columbia Rent Commission permanent; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3523. Also, petition of Mr. M. E. Meservey, assistant postmaster, and four other employees of the Nevada City (Calif.) post office; Farr & McComb (Inc.), Los Angeles, Calif.; L. F. Grammes & Sons (Inc.), of Allentown, Pa., relative to the postal salary increase legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3524. Also, petition of Oakland Company, California Grays, of Oakland, Calif.; San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, Calif.; Mr. W. L. Redke, of Monrovia, Calif., all urging the passage of House bill 6484 for the retirement of disabled emergency Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3525. Also, petition of Joseph Mathers, of Placerville, Calif., and nine other citizens of that city, all protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill or any other religious legislation; and M. V. Mathers and 15 other citizens of Placerville, Calif., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bill or any other religious legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3526. Also, petition of Hartford Post, No. 155, Department of California and Nevada, Grand Army of the Republic, and Halleck Post, No. 19, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of California and Nevada, urging the repeal of the law providing for coinage to be issued for the benefit of the Stone Mountain Confederate Monument Association; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

3527. Also, telegram from Paul I. Fagan & Co., of San Francisco, urging issuance of rule for consideration of China trade act; to the Committee on Rules.

3528. Also, petition of California Manufacturers' Association, Oakland, Calif., protesting against the Jones bill to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes as amended by the act of Congress approved May 16, 1906; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3529. Also, petition of H. N. Cook Belting Co., of San Francisco, Calif., relative to appropriations for Department of Commerce activities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3530. Also, petition of Mr. A. L. Enos, of Angels Camp, Calif., urging increased appropriation for citizens' military training camps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3531. Also, petition of Sacramento Bar Association, Sacramento, Calif., urging passage of legislation to increase salaries of Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3532. Also, petitions of California Farm Bureau Federation, Berkeley, Calif., urging establishment of forest experiment station in California, and Pacific Logging Congress, endorsing work of the Forest Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3533. Also, petition of Board of Supervisors of San Joaquin County, Calif., urging completion of survey of the lower Sacramento River control works project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

3534. Also, petition of Kansas State Bankers' Association, Topeka, Kans., protesting against branch banking; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3535. Also, petition of E. F. Blaine, Seattle, Wash., protesting against the change of the name of Mount Rainier to Mount Tacoma; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3536. Also, petition of G. H. Justice, Macdoel, Calif., indorsing the public shooting ground bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3537. Also, petition of Harry L. Walker, San Francisco, Calif., indorsing Shreve bill (H. R. 8352); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3538. Also, petition of the National Legislative Committee, American Legion, Washington, D. C., relative to House bill 9629, for the reorganization of the Government departments; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3539. Also, petition of National Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, San Francisco, Calif., indorsing House bill 849, providing for an annuity for employees of the Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3540. Also, petition of Harvey M. Toy, chairman California Highway Commission, San Francisco, Calif., indorsing and urging passage of the Colton bill (H. R. 6133); to the Committee on Roads.

3541. Also, petition of Milwaukee Association of Commerce, Milwaukee, Wis., indorsing the Lakes-to-the-Gulf waterway project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3542. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of residents of Corvallis, Oreg., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3543. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Marion and Benton Counties, Oreg., protesting against passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3544. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Willamina, Oreg., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3545. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Tillamook, Oreg., against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3546. Also, petition of Clara Dillon and others, of Boardman, Morrow County, Oreg., against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3547. Also, petition of 75 residents of Hereford and Long Creek, Oreg., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3548. By Mr. SMITH: Petition of the Loyal Orange Institution of the United States, Boise Loyal Orange Lodge, No. 360, urging ample appropriations for maintaining and improving the air forces to combat those of any other country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3549. By Mr. WATKINS: Petition of City Council of Portland, Oreg., urging Congress to provide funds to build a hospital on a site offered by the medical school of the University of Oregon for veterans of the World War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3550. Also, petition of citizens of Portland, Oreg., opposing the enactment of Senate bill 3218, known as the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

SATURDAY, January 24, 1925

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 22, 1925)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11749) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1656. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the La Plata River compact;

S. 3036. An act to amend the law relating to timber operations on the Menominee Reservation in Wisconsin;

S. 3792. An act to amend section 81 of the Judicial Code; and S. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution authorizing the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau to grant a right of way over United States Veterans' Bureau hospital reservation at Knoxville, Iowa.

SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. OVERMAN presented the certificate of the Governor of the State of North Carolina certifying to the election of FURNIFOLD M. SIMMONS as a Senator from the State for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, 1925, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 1924, FURNIFOLD M. SIMMONS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of North Carolina a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th of March, 1925.

Witness: His excellency our governor, Angus Wilton McLean, and our seal affixed at Raleigh, N. C., this 22d day of January, in the year of our Lord 1925.

ANGUS W. McLEAN, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

W. N. EVERETT, Secretary of State.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. BAYARD. I ask unanimous consent to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the Record resolutions adopted by the Council of the Mayor and the Council of Wilmington, Del.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILMINGTON, DEL., January 22, 1925.

Whereas we believe the United States should clearly make up its mind whether it desires to participate in the World Court, and thus join the other great nations of the world in an attempt to substitute law and the principle of arbitration for war as a method for settling international disputes: Be it

Resolved, That the Council of the Mayor and Council of Wilmington urges the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate of the United States, by whatever procedure is found to be best, to get before the full Senate for a vote a resolution providing for the participation of the United States in the World Court on the Harding-Hughes terms. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our two Senators, Congressman, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. WILLIS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Youngstown, Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BROOKHART presented the petition and complaint of the Arthur Arent Laboratories (Inc.), of Des Moines, Iowa, in the matter of certain charges against George M. Hunt, acting director Forest Products Laboratory and in charge of section of wood preservation, Forest Products Laboratory, and Ernest Bateman, chemist, Forest Products Laboratory, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petition of the Ladies' Aid Society of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Fort Dodge, Iowa, signed by Mrs. Frank O. Peterson, praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a World Court mass meeting at Des Moines, Iowa, favoring the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BINGHAM presented the petition of John Hay Lodge No. 61, Knights of Pythias, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation for the relief of immigrants stranded